arXiv:1610.06469v1 [math.NA] 20 Oct 2016

Fast and guaranteed blind multichannel deconvolution under a bilinear system model

Kiryung Lee, Ning Tian, and Justin K. Romberg *†‡

Friday 21st October, 2016

Abstract

Blind deconvolution resolves unknown channel and input signal from their convolution. Recently, performance guarantees for fast algorithms under linear subspace models have been derived, and some of the results were further extended to a subsampled case and to a more general union of subspaces model, which represents sparsity in a certain transform domain. Motivated by a channel estimation problem in underwater acoustics, we consider a scenario where the unknown signal is observed through multiple unknown correlated channels, which are accurately approximated using a bilinear model by imposing structure on the system. We propose a new iterative algorithm for multichannel blind deconvolution using this bilinear channel model, which consists of computing an extreme eigenvector of given matrices. In particular, we show that the proposed iterative algorithm with a cheap initialization converges fast to a stable estimate of the unknown channel parameters. Our numerical results demonstrate that the empirical performance is consistent with the presented theory.

1 Introduction

Blind deconvolution refers to the resolution of two unknown signals from their convolution. Typically, one signal represents an input signal and the other signal represents the impulse response of system. This problem arises ubiquitously in various applications: image deblurring, channel estimation, seismic data analysis, speech dereverberation, convolutive dictionary learning, imaging with unknown point spread function, to name a few. Blind deconvolution is a classical problem in signal processing and various solutions using deterministic or probabilistic models on signal and/or

*This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under grants IIS 14-47879, CCF 14-22540 and by the Office of Naval Research under grant N00014-13-1-0632.

†The authors are with the School of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA 30332, USA (e-mail: {kiryung,jrom}@ece.gatech.edu, ningtian@gatech.edu).

‡This paper was presented in part at ITW 2016 [1].

system have been studied (e.g., see [2]). In recent years, there has been remarkable progress in theory of blind deconvolution. For example, the identifiability of solutions to blind deconvolution has been studied as the fundamental limit from an information theoretic perspective [3–8]. Practical algorithms with provable performance guarantees have been studied for subspace or sparsity models in the light of success of compressed sensing and low-rank matrix recovery: convex method [9], alternating minimization [10], gradient descent [11]. More recent works studied a more challenging blind deconvolution problem with off-the-grid sparsity models [12, 13].

Unlike recent progresses in the theory of single blind deconvolution, we consider a multichannel blind deconvolution problem in this paper. With more redundancy in the multiple outputs given by convolution of a unknown common input signal with unknown diverse filters, multichannel blind deconvolution is already an easier problem than that with only a single channel. Inspired from various practical applications, which we elaborate later, we introduce a bilinear model for the unknown filters. This bilinear system model as a strong prior information on the unknown solution, enables stable recovery with provable performance guarantee. In particular, we propose a fast iterative algorithm, steps of which only involve computing an extreme eigenvector. The proposed iterative algorithm provide stable recovery in the presence of noise and for the input of finite length. Remarkably, under certain randomness on the bilinear model, we show that the iterative algorithm provide non-asymptotic performance guarantees for stable recovery. These results distinguish themselves from the analogous previous results [14–16], where both the empirical performance and theoretic guarantee are restricted to the noiseless or asymptotic case.

1.1 Previous works for multichannel blind deconvolution

While rigorous theory for single channel blind deconvolution became available only recently, the counter part for multichannel blind deconvolution, which is an easier problem with much redundancy, has been available for long time. Even in 1990s, there already existed guaranteed algorithms for multichannel blind deconvolution mostly in the context of channel estimation in the physical layer of communication network (see e.g., [17, 18] for a survey).

In a special scenario of multichannel blind deconvolution, where the input signal is long and has enough diversity and the channel impulse responses are short and distinctive one another, several methods based on commutativity of convolution were developed in 1990s (e.g., [14–16]). These methods were proven to recover the unknown channel impulse responses up to scaling ambiguity from noise-free channel outputs or asymptotically from infinitely long input signal. However, when the input signal has finite length and the outputs are observed with noise, not only non-asymptotic guarantee has been missing but also the algorithms are successful only with a very long input signal.

1.2 Summary of contributions

Our work was motivated from the observation that the channel impulse responses often admit a parsimonious model, which enables stable recovery as a restrictive prior to the unknown parameters. For example, a multi-path echo system has sparse channel impulse responses. Yet for another example, smooth point spread functions in various imaging systems are modelled to be sparse over analytic transforms [19]. A more interesting parsimonious model is due to the recent idea of linearizing a parametric model by manifold embedding [20]. In this paper, we consider a particular bilinear model that separates the gain and shape of channel impulse responses, where the shapes are jointly modelled using a low-dimensional subspace. This model has been shown very effective for a channel estimation problem in underwater acoustics by a subset of the authors of this paper [21].

Under the scenario where the unknown channel impulse responses follow the aforementioned bilinear model, we propose computationally efficient algorithms modified from the old methods for multichannel deconvolution based on the commutativity of convolution. While the idea is not restricted to a particular method, for concreteness, we propose an iterative algorithm called the *alternating cross convolution method*, which is modified from the cross convolution method by Xu et al. [14]. First of all, due to a more restrictive bilinear model, the alternating cross convolution method can recover the unknown channel impulse responses from short input in the presence of noise. We also provide non-asymptotic performance guarantees under some randomness assumption in the bilinear model.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. The multichannel blind deconvolution problem is formulated under a bilinear channel model in Section 2. After we review relevant previous methods for multichannel blind deconvolution in Section 3, we propose an iterative algorithm for multichannel blind deconvolution under the bilinear channel model in Section 4, which is modified from the cross convolution method. Our main results on non-asymptotic stable recovery are presented in Section 5, whose proofs are deferred to Sections 7 and 8. We demonstrated numerical results that support our theory in Section 6 and conclude the paper in Section 9.

2 Problem Statement

2.1 Notations

For a positive integer K, the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, K\}$ will be denoted by $[K]$. We use various matrices involving the circular convolution operator. The circulant matrix whose first column is $\boldsymbol{h} \in \mathbb{R}^L$ is denoted by $\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{h}} \in \mathbb{R}^{L\times L}$. Then $\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{h}}\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{h} \circledast \boldsymbol{x}$ for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^L$, where $\circledast$ denotes the circular convolution modulo L. Let $\mathfrak{J} \in \mathbb{R}^{L\times L}$ denote the time reversal operator modulo L defined by

$$\mathfrak{J} := [\boldsymbol{e}_1, \boldsymbol{e}_L, \boldsymbol{e}_{L-1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{e}_2]. \tag{1}$$

Then the transpose of $\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{h}}$ satisfies $\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{h}}^{\top} = \boldsymbol{C}_{\check{\boldsymbol{h}}}$. Let $\boldsymbol{I}_K$ and $\boldsymbol{0}_{M\times N}$ denote the K-by-K identity matrix and the M-by-N matrix whose entries are zero, respectively. Then $\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]} \in \mathbb{R}^{K\times L}$ is defined by

$$\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]} := [\boldsymbol{I}_K, \boldsymbol{0}_{K\times(L-K)}].$$

Then $\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{h}} \in \mathbb{R}^{L\times K}$ will denote the Toeplitz matrix $\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{h}}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^{\top}$, which is a submatrix of $\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{h}}$ obtained by taking the first K columns. Given a vector $\boldsymbol{v} \in \mathbb{R}^L$, $\mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{v})$ denote the L-by-L diagonal matrix whose diagonal entries are the elements of $\boldsymbol{v}$. The tensor product will be denoted by $\otimes$. The Kronecker product is then denoted by $\tilde{\otimes}$ to be distinguished from the tensor product. Given a matrix $\boldsymbol{A} = [\boldsymbol{a}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_N] \in \mathbb{R}^{M\times N}$, $\mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{A})$ will denote the vectorization of $\boldsymbol{A}$, which is a column vector of length MN given by $[\boldsymbol{a}_1^{\top}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{a}_N^{\top}]^{\top}$.

2.2 Multichannel blind deconvolution

Multichannel blind deconvolution is formulated as a biinear inverse problem as follows: We observe an unknown signal $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^L$ convolved with multiple unknown channel impulse responses $(\boldsymbol{h}_m)_{m=1}^M \subset \mathbb{R}^L$ by

$$\boldsymbol{y}_m = \boldsymbol{h}_m \circledast \boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{w}_m, \quad m = 1, \ldots, M, \tag{2}$$

where $\circledast$ denotes the circular convolution[1] modulo L and $\boldsymbol{w}_m \in \mathbb{R}^L$ denotes additive noise. Given only the outputs $\{\boldsymbol{y}_m\}_{m=1}^M$, it is desired to recover the unknown channel impulse responses $\{\boldsymbol{h}_m\}_{m=1}^M$. Once the channel impulse responses are reconstructed, the recovery of the unknown input $\boldsymbol{x}$ reduces to nonblind deconvolution, which is an overdetermined linear inverse problem and can be easily solved for example as a least squares.

In this paper, we are interested in multichannel blind deconvolution in the following setup.

(M1) FIR channel model: $\{\boldsymbol{h}_m\}_{m=1}^M$ are supported on $[K]$ where $K \ll L$.

(M2) The coefficients of $\{\boldsymbol{h}_m\}_{m=1}^M$ follow a joint bilinear model designed by domain knowledge in specific applications.

(M3) Additive noise is white subgaussian with zero mean.

While the conditions in (M1) and (M3) have been typical in the literature on multichannel blind deconvolution (e.g., [14–16]), the bilinear model in (M2) is a new additional prior in this paper, motivated from a channel estimation problem in underwater acoustics. We elaborated on the bilinear model as follows. Let $\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_m = \boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}\boldsymbol{h}_m \in \mathbb{R}^K$ denote the subvector of $\boldsymbol{h}_m \in \mathbb{R}^L$ obtained with the index set $[K]$, which represents the FIR filter coefficients of $\boldsymbol{h}_m$. Then

$$\boldsymbol{h}_m = \boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^{\top}\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_m, \quad \forall m \in [M]. \tag{3}$$

[1]We used the circular convolution for the ease of analysis. Indeed, any linear convolution can be rewritten as a circular convolution with zero-padding. Therefore, the use of circular convolutions is not a restriction.

Let $\underline{\boldsymbol{h}} \in \mathbb{R}^{MK}$ denote the concatenation of the FIR coefficients for all channels, i.e.,

$$\underline{\boldsymbol{h}} := [\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_1^\top, \ldots, \underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_M^\top]^\top. \tag{4}$$

Our bilinear model assumes that $\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}$ satisfies

$$\underline{\boldsymbol{h}} = \begin{bmatrix} a_1 \boldsymbol{\Phi}_1 \\ a_2 \boldsymbol{\Phi}_2 \\ \vdots \\ a_M \boldsymbol{\Phi}_M \end{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{u}, \tag{5}$$

where $\boldsymbol{a} = [a_1, \ldots, a_M]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^M$ with $a_m > 0$ for all $m \in [M]$ represents the gains in all channels, and $\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathbb{R}^D$ corresponds to the coefficients in the expression of all shapes of $\{\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_m\}_{m=1}^M$ (under certain normalization) with respect to the subspace model using the basis $[\boldsymbol{\Phi}_1^\top, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\Phi}_1^\top]^\top$, which is known a priori.

Embedding a manifold that represents a parametric model with continuous-valued parameters to a low-dimensional subspace has been proposed and analyzed [20]. This embedding converts a highly nonlinear parametric estimation problem to a nonparametric linear or multi-linear inverse problem. In particular, in the context of simultaneous recovery of both unknown signal and system, such linearization of the parametric model enables the recovery to be formulated as a matrix-valued (or tensor-valued) linear inverse problem with a low-rankness prior. Recent development on low-rank matrix/tensor recovery provided practical algorithms with low cost with provable performance guarantees. (For an overview, e.g., see [22]). Under certain scenarios with randomness assumptions, these algorithms are guaranteed to operate successfully at the parameter regime that scales near optimally.

In our formulation, the linearization by manifold embedding applies only to the shapes of $\{\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_m\}_{m=1}^M$ and the gains are treated separately. This results in a bilinear channel model in (5).

Note that the model in (5) is equivalently rewritten as

$$\underline{\boldsymbol{h}} = \boldsymbol{\Phi} \mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{u}\boldsymbol{a}^\top), \tag{6}$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{\Phi} := \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Phi}_1 & \boldsymbol{0} & \ldots & \boldsymbol{0} \\ \boldsymbol{0} & \boldsymbol{\Phi}_2 & \ldots & \boldsymbol{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \boldsymbol{0} & \boldsymbol{0} & \ldots & \boldsymbol{\Phi}_M \end{bmatrix}. \tag{7}$$

This alternative expression is interpreted as a linear model with a separability (rank-1) prior on the coefficient vector.

We assumed that the order of FIR filters K is much smaller than the length L of the input. In this scenario, recovery methods that estimate only the unknown filters by using some statistics obtained by absorbing the unknown input $\boldsymbol{x}$ were shown successful (e.g., [14–16]). With the bilinear channel model, the number of unknown parameters in the system becomes even smaller. Therefore, we build our solution upon the old methods for multichannel blind deconvolution so that it exploits the bilinear channel model. Before we describe our own recovery algorithm, we provide a brief review on the relevant previous methods for multichannel blind deconvolution in the next section.

3 Previous Methods for FIR Multichannel Blind Deconvolution

Our solution has been modified from the cross convolution method for multichannel blind deconvolution [14]. In fact, other methods for multichannel blind deconvolution (e.g., [14–16]) can be modified into analogous methods to exploit the bilinear channel model. In this section, we briefly review the cross convolution method by Xu et al. [14] and a related subspace method by Moulines et al. [15]. In the original works, multichannel blind deconvolution was formulated with linear convolutions. We first paraphrase these methods for our circular convolution formulation.

3.1 Cross convolution method

Cross convolution methods for multichannel blind deconvolution [14] was derived based on the key property of the multichannel convolutive system, that is the commutativity of the convolution operator. Recall that it was assumed that the unknown filters $\boldsymbol{h}_m$'s follow the FIR model given in (3) with $2K-1 \leqslant L$. In the noiseless case, by the commutativity of convolutions, the vector $\underline{\boldsymbol{h}} \in \mathbb{R}^{MK}$ defined in (4), which corresponds to the concatenation of all FIR coefficients, is determined by

$$\boldsymbol{M}_y \underline{\boldsymbol{h}} = \boldsymbol{0}_{M(M-1)L/2 \times 1}, \tag{8}$$

where $\boldsymbol{M}_y \in \mathbb{R}^{M(M-1)L/2 \times MK}$ is defined by

$$\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{y}} := \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_2} & -\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_1} & \boldsymbol{0} & \boldsymbol{0} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{0} & \boldsymbol{0} \\ \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_3} & \boldsymbol{0} & -\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_1} & \boldsymbol{0} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{0} & \boldsymbol{0} \\ \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_4} & \boldsymbol{0} & \boldsymbol{0} & -\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_1} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{0} & \boldsymbol{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_M} & \boldsymbol{0} & \boldsymbol{0} & \boldsymbol{0} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{0} & -\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_1} \\ \boldsymbol{0} & \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_3} & -\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_2} & \boldsymbol{0} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{0} & \boldsymbol{0} \\ \boldsymbol{0} & \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_4} & \boldsymbol{0} & -\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_2} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{0} & \boldsymbol{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \boldsymbol{0} & \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_M} & \boldsymbol{0} & \boldsymbol{0} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{0} & -\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \boldsymbol{0} & \boldsymbol{0} & \boldsymbol{0} & \boldsymbol{0} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_M} & -\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_{M-1}} \end{bmatrix}.$$

It was shown [14, 16] that $\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}$ is uniquely determined up to scaling ambiguity by (8) under a mild algebraic condition that the polynomials generated by $\{\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_m\}_{m=1}^M$ have no common zero. In the presence of noise, $\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}$ is estimated as the minimum eigenvector of $\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{y}}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{y}}$. Note that $\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{y}}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{y}}$ is computed as a collection of cross correlation of outputs $\{\boldsymbol{y}_m\}_{m=1}^M$ up to a small lag K. When the additive noise is white, in the asymptotic where the input length L goes to the infinity, the grammian matrix $\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{y}}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{y}}$ converges to its noise-free version plus a scaled identity. Since adding a scaled identity to a given matrix does not change the eigenvectors. The estimate of $\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}$ is consistent in the asymptotic in L. However, no non-asymptotic has been known. Furthermore, the empirical performance of the cross convolution method deteriorates dramatically as L gets smaller.

3.2 Subspace method

The subspace method by Moulines et al. [15] is another solution to multichannel blind deconvolution that shares the same aforementioned algebraic or asymptotic performance guarantees. In the following, we provide an alternative view of the subspace method by Moulines et al. [15], which is somewhat different from the original derivation but will demonstrate clearly how the subspace method is related to the cross convolution method by Xu et al. [14].

Define $\underline{\boldsymbol{T}}_{\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_m} \in \mathbb{R}^{(2K-1)\times K}$ by

$$\underline{\boldsymbol{T}}_{\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_m} := \boldsymbol{S}_{[2K-1]} \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{h}_m} \boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top,$$

where $\boldsymbol{h}_m = [\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_m^\top, \boldsymbol{0}_{1\times(L-K)}]^\top$. Then $\underline{\boldsymbol{T}}_{\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_m}$ is a matrix representation of the linear convolution of a column vector of length K with $\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_m \in \mathbb{R}^K$.

Then since the entries of $\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{h}_m}^\top$ are zero except the first $2K-1$ columns, it follows that

$$\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_m}^\top = \boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{y}_m}^\top = \boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{h}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top = \boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{h}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{S}_{[2K-1]}^\top\boldsymbol{S}_{[2K-1]}\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top = \underline{\boldsymbol{T}}_{\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{S}_{[2K-1]}\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top. \tag{9}$$

Next suppose that $\boldsymbol{S}_{[2K-1]}\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top$ has full row rank. Then by (9), it follows that $[\boldsymbol{T}_{\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_1},\dots,\boldsymbol{T}_{\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_M}]^\top$ and $[\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_1},\dots,\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_M}]^\top$ span the same subspace. Therefore, two matrices $[\boldsymbol{T}_{\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_1},\dots,\boldsymbol{T}_{\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_M}]$ and $[\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_1},\dots,\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_M}]$ have the same null space. Let $\underline{\boldsymbol{q}}\in\mathbb{R}^{MK}$ be a null vector of $[\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_1},\dots,\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_M}]$. We partition $\underline{\boldsymbol{q}}$ into M nonoverlapping blocks of length K so that $\underline{\boldsymbol{q}} = [\underline{\boldsymbol{q}}_1^\top,\dots,\underline{\boldsymbol{q}}_M^\top]^\top$. Then, similar to $\underline{\boldsymbol{T}}_{\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_m}$, we define a Toeplitz matrix $\underline{\boldsymbol{T}}_{\underline{\boldsymbol{q}}_m}\in\mathbb{R}^{(2K-1)\times K}$ by

$$\underline{\boldsymbol{T}}_{\underline{\boldsymbol{q}}_m} := \boldsymbol{S}_{[2K-1]}\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{q}_m}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top, \quad \forall m\in[M].$$

Again, each $\underline{\boldsymbol{T}}_{\underline{\boldsymbol{q}}_m}$ represents the linear convolution of a column vector of length K with $\underline{\boldsymbol{q}}_m\in\mathbb{R}^K$. By the commutativity of convolutions, it follows that

$$\underline{\boldsymbol{T}}_{\underline{\boldsymbol{q}}_m}\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_m = \underline{\boldsymbol{q}}_m * \underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_m = \underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_m * \underline{\boldsymbol{q}}_m = \underline{\boldsymbol{T}}_{\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_m}\underline{\boldsymbol{q}}_m,$$

where $*:\mathbb{R}^K\times\mathbb{R}^K\to\mathbb{R}^{2K-1}$ denotes the linear convolution operator. Therefore, the unknown FIR coefficients $\underline{\boldsymbol{h}} = [\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_1^\top,\dots,\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_M^\top]^\top$ satisfies

$$\left[\underline{\boldsymbol{T}}_{\underline{\boldsymbol{q}}_1},\dots,\underline{\boldsymbol{T}}_{\underline{\boldsymbol{q}}_M}\right]\underline{\boldsymbol{h}} = \boldsymbol{0}_{(2K-1)\times 1}. \tag{10}$$

In the noiseless case, the subspace method by Moulines et al. [15] identifies $\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}$ as the solution to the systems in the form of (10) for all $\underline{\boldsymbol{q}}$ satisfying

$$[\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_1},\dots,\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_M}]\,\underline{\boldsymbol{q}} = \boldsymbol{0}_{L\times 1}. \tag{11}$$

In fact, a particular set of null vectors of $[\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_1},\dots,\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_M}]$ are given explicitly as follows. For example, if $\underline{\boldsymbol{q}}_1 = \underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_2$, $\underline{\boldsymbol{q}}_2 = -\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_1$, and $\underline{\boldsymbol{q}}_m = \boldsymbol{0}$ for $m>2$, then $\underline{\boldsymbol{q}}$ satisfies (11). The corresponding system given by (10) is expressed as

$$\left[\underline{\boldsymbol{T}}_{\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_2}, -\underline{\boldsymbol{T}}_{\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_2}, \boldsymbol{0}_{(2K-1)\times K},\cdots,\boldsymbol{0}_{(2K-1)\times K}\right]\underline{\boldsymbol{h}} = \boldsymbol{0}_{(2K-1)\times 1}. \tag{12}$$

Since $\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\boldsymbol{S}_{[2K-1]}^\top$ has the full rank, through (9), the system given by (12) is equivalent to

$$[\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_2}, -\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_1}, \boldsymbol{0}_{L\times K},\cdots,\boldsymbol{0}_{L\times K}]\,\underline{\boldsymbol{h}} = \boldsymbol{0}_{L\times 1}. \tag{13}$$

In fact, the collection of systems given by (13) for all pairs $(\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_m,\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_{m'})$ with $m\neq m'$ is equivalent to the system given by (8). From this perspective, we note that in the noiseless case, the subspace

method by Moulines et al. [15] is essentially a generalized version of the cross convolution method [14].

In the noisy case, the subspace method by Moulines et al. [15] computes the eigenvectors $\underline{\boldsymbol{q}}$'s of $[\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_M}]$, whose corresponding eigenvalues are dominated by the other large eigenvalues. Then, $\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}$ is identified as the smallest eigenvector of the concatenation of $[\underline{\boldsymbol{T}}_{\underline{\boldsymbol{q}}_1}, \ldots, \underline{\boldsymbol{T}}_{\underline{\boldsymbol{q}}_M}]$ for given $\underline{\boldsymbol{q}}$'s. In a nut shell, the subspace method goes through the cascade of two eigenvalue decompositions, which makes the sensitivity analysis more difficult compared to the cross convolution method, which use a single eigenvalue decomposition by using a fixed set of $\underline{\boldsymbol{q}}$'s given by distinct pairs of the outputs. While the idea in this paper is not restricted to a particular method, simply for the convenience of analysis due to the aforementioned reason, we chose the cross convolution method as a base algorithm from which we modify our own iterative algorithm to solve multichannel blind deconvolution with the additional bilinear prior on the unknown filters. The iterative algorithm is described in the next section.

4 Alternating Cross-Convolution Method

By applying the bilinear channel model in (6) to the cross convolution method, we propose to solve multichannel blind deconvolution by finding a solution to the following optimization problem.

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{a}} \quad & \|\boldsymbol{M}_y \boldsymbol{\Phi} \mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{u}\boldsymbol{a}^\top)\|_2^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \|\boldsymbol{\Phi} \mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{u}\boldsymbol{a}^\top)\|_2 = 1 \\ & a_m \geqslant 0, \quad \forall m = 1, \ldots, M, \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where Φ is defined in (7).

Note that with the separability constraint, (14) is no longer a simple problem of finding the least dominant eigenvector of a given matrix and there is no known practical algorithm that finds an exact solution to (14). On the other hand, if either of the two variables $\boldsymbol{u}$ and $\boldsymbol{a}$ in (14) is fixed, it reduces to the ordinary eigenvalue decomposition problem. Finding the least dominant eigenvector can be done for example by applying power iteration twice. With this observation, we propose an alternating minimization algorithm, which we call as the "alternating cross convolution method" and is summarized in Algorithm 1, to find an approximate solution to (14). In this algorithm, the nonnegative constraint on the elements of $\boldsymbol{a}$ is not explicitly enforced.

In algorithm 1 and algorithm 1, we subtract off $\hat{\sigma}_w^2 \boldsymbol{I}_{MK}$ where $\hat{\sigma}_w^2$ is an estimate of the noise variance σ_w^2. In the original cross convolution method by Xu et al. [14], the channel coefficients are computed as the least dominant eigenvector of $\boldsymbol{M}_y^\top \boldsymbol{M}_y$. Therefore, adding any scaled identity to $\boldsymbol{M}_y^\top \boldsymbol{M}_y$ does not affect the estimate. In particular, even when a good estimate of the noise variance $\hat{\sigma}_2$ is given, subtracting $\sigma_w^2 \boldsymbol{I}_{MK}$ from $\boldsymbol{M}_y^\top \boldsymbol{M}_y$, which cancels out the noise covariance portion, did

Algorithm 1: Alternating Cross Convolution Method

input : $\boldsymbol{M}_y^\top \boldsymbol{M}_y$, $\boldsymbol{\Phi}$, $\hat{\sigma}_w$, M, L, $\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_0$

output: $\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}$

$\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}} \leftarrow \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_0$;

while *stop condition not satisfied* **do**

  $\boldsymbol{V}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{I}_M \tilde{\otimes} \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}$;

  $\boldsymbol{\Xi} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{V}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top (\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{y}}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{y}} - \hat{\sigma}_w^2 (M-1) L \boldsymbol{I}_{MK}) \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{V}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}$;

  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}} \leftarrow$ FindMinEigenvector($\boldsymbol{\Xi}$);

  $\boldsymbol{Y}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}} \leftarrow \widehat{\boldsymbol{a}} \tilde{\otimes} \boldsymbol{I}_D$;

  $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{Y}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}}^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top (\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{y}}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{y}} - \hat{\sigma}_w^2 (M-1) L \boldsymbol{I}_{MK}) \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{Y}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}}$;

  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}} \leftarrow$ FindMinEigenvector($\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}$);

end

$\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\Phi}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}} \tilde{\otimes} \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}})$;

not help at all. However, in our alternating minimization approach, the estimation error in the previous iteration propagates and the amplification of error in the next iteration can be reduced by canceling out the noise covariance term in $\boldsymbol{M}_y^\top \boldsymbol{M}_y$.

To avoid alternating minimization get stuck in local minimum, it is highly important to design a good initialization scheme. Our initialization was inspired from the lifting reformulation (e.g., see [9]) and spectral initialization. More specifically, we consider the following lifted reformulation of multichannel blind deconvolution as a tensor-valued linear inverse problem with the rank-1 prior: Let $\boldsymbol{y} = [\boldsymbol{y}_1^\top, \dots, \boldsymbol{y}_M^\top]^\top$. Then $\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{ML}$ consists of noisy trilinear measurements of the triplet $(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{a})$, or equivalently, noisy linear measurements of the 3-way tensor $\boldsymbol{u} \otimes \boldsymbol{x} \otimes \boldsymbol{a}$. It follows that there exists a linear operator $\mathcal{A} : \mathbb{R}^{D \times L \times M} \to \mathbb{R}^{ML}$ that maps $\boldsymbol{u} \otimes \boldsymbol{x} \otimes \boldsymbol{a}$ to the noiseless measurements given by (2) with $\boldsymbol{w}_m = \boldsymbol{0}$ for all $m \in [M]$. Let $\boldsymbol{w} = [\boldsymbol{w}_1^\top, \dots, \boldsymbol{w}_M^\top]^\top$. Then the multichannel blind deconvolution problem is written as the following inverse problem

$$\boldsymbol{y} = \mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}) + \boldsymbol{w},$$

where i) the rank of the unknown 3-way tensor $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}$ is 1 and ii) the elements of the third mode factor of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}$ are positive.

Following now the standard spectral initialization, we first apply the adjoint operator $\mathcal{A}^*$ to the measurement vector $\boldsymbol{y}$. Applying the adjoint operator can be implemented at low cost using the characterization of $\mathcal{A}^*$ using the fast Fourier transform. However, given the 3-way tensor $\mathcal{A}^*\boldsymbol{y}$, it is not easy to compute the best rank-1 approximation exactly. Instead, we propose to estimate just one factor $\boldsymbol{u}$ through the following procedure.

Let

$$\boldsymbol{Z} = \mathcal{A}^*\boldsymbol{y} \times_3 \boldsymbol{1}_M = \mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{u} \otimes \boldsymbol{x} \otimes \boldsymbol{a}) \times_3 \boldsymbol{1}_M + \mathcal{A}^*\boldsymbol{w},$$

where where $\times_3$ denotes the multiplication along the third mode. In other words, we fold the tensor $\mathcal{A}^* \boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times L \times M}$ by summing M slices of size $D \times L$ along the third mode with the same weight 1. The choice of the equal unit weight on each slice is justified by the fact that the vector $\boldsymbol{a} \in \mathbb{R}^M$ of unknown channel gains has positive entries. In the noiseless case, we compute an estimate $\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}$ of $\boldsymbol{u}$ as the first dominant eigenvector of $\boldsymbol{Z}\boldsymbol{Z}^\top$. The following lemma provides an expression of $\boldsymbol{Z}\boldsymbol{Z}^\top$ given in terms of $\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_m}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_{m'}}$ for $m, m' \in [M]$, which are computed as cross-correlation of the outputs up to lag K.

Lemma 4.1. *$\boldsymbol{Z}\boldsymbol{Z}^\top$ is written as*

$$\boldsymbol{Z}\boldsymbol{Z}^\top = \sum_{m,m'=1}^{M} \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{m'}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_m}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_{m'}} \boldsymbol{\Phi}_m.$$

Proof of Lemma 4.1. See Section A. □

In the noisy case, we subtract the noise covariance portion and estimate $\boldsymbol{u}$ as the first dominant eigenvector of $\boldsymbol{Z}\boldsymbol{Z}^\top - \sum_{m=1}^M \sigma_w^2 L \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m^\top \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m$, which is rewritten by Lemma 4.1 as

$$\sum_{m=1}^{M} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m^\top (\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{y}_m}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{y}_m} - \sigma_w^2 L \boldsymbol{I}_L) \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m + \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{\substack{m'=1 \\ m' \neq m}}^{M} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{y}_m}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{y}_{m'}} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m.$$

The resulting initialization algorithm is summarized in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2: Initialization

input : $\{\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_m}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_{m'}}\}_{m,m'=1}^M$, $\{\boldsymbol{\Phi}_m\}_{m=1}^M$, $\hat{\sigma}_w$, L
output: $\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}$
$\boldsymbol{Q} \leftarrow \sum_{m,m'=1}^M \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{m'}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_m}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_{m'}} \boldsymbol{\Phi}_m - \sum_{m=1}^M \hat{\sigma}_w^2 L \boldsymbol{\Phi}_m^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}_m$;
$\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}} \leftarrow$ FindMaxEigenvector($\boldsymbol{Q}$);

The iterations of the alternating cross convolution method in Algorithm 1 and the initialization in Algorithm 2 compute estimates as the most or least dominant eigenvector of a given matrix. In fact, the original cross convolution method by Xu et al. [14] also computes an estimate in a similar way. Sensitivity of the extreme eigenvector in the presence of additive noise has been analyzed [23]. The perturbation in an extreme eigenvector is less than an upper bound, which is inversely proportional to the difference between the corresponding eigenvalue and the next neighboring eigenvalue, when the eigenvalues are sorted in the non-increasing order of magnitudes. As demonstrated in Section 5 and 6, with the aid of the bilinear model, the alternating cross convolution method in Algorithm 1 initialized by Algorithm 2 is superior compared to the original cross convolution method in both theoretic and empirical performances. To provide intuition behind the difference in performance of the two methods, in Figure 1, we observed the distribution of eigenvalues of various



Figure 1: Eigenvalues of various matrices sorted in the non-increasing order. ($\boldsymbol{\Phi}_m$'s are standard i.i.d. Gaussian matrices. $K = 100$, $M = 5$, $D = 10$. Noiseless case.) (a) $\boldsymbol{M}_y^\top \boldsymbol{M}_y \in \mathbb{R}^{MK \times MK}$. (b) Zoom-in of (a) for the 20 smallest eigenvalues. (c) $\Xi \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$ in algorithm 1 of Algorithm 1. (d) $\Upsilon \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times D}$ in algorithm 1 of Algorithm 1. (e) $\boldsymbol{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times D}$ in Algorithm 2.

matrices arising in these algorithms, when the matrix $\boldsymbol{\Phi}$ in the bilinear model is random. Figure 11a shows the eigenvalues of $\boldsymbol{M}_y^\top \boldsymbol{M}_y$ in the non-increasing order. The zoomed-in view of the last 20 out of 500 eigenvalues is shown in Figure 11b. As shown in Figure 11a and Figure 11b, there is almost no gap between the smallest and the second smallest eigenvalues of $\boldsymbol{M}_y^\top \boldsymbol{M}_y$. Therefore, the estimate by the original cross convolution method, which is given as the least dominant eigenvector of $\boldsymbol{M}_y^\top \boldsymbol{M}_y$, is highly sensitive to additive noise. This is also consistent with the empirical performance of the cross convolution method. On the other hand, the iterations of Algorithm 1 compute estimates as the least dominant eigenvectors of $\boldsymbol{\Xi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}$, respectively. As shown in Figure 11c and 11d, these matrices have significant gap between the two smallest eigenvalues. Therefore, we expect that the corresponding estimates are robust against additive noise. Similarly, the initial estimate by Algorithm 2 given as the most dominant eigenvector of $\boldsymbol{Q}$, is also stable due to the significant gap between the two largest eigenvalues of $\boldsymbol{Q}$, which is presented in Figure 11e. In the next section, we will present performance guarantees of Algorithm 1 under certain randomness on the bilinear model, whose proofs are essentially elaboration of the above arguments with mathematical rigor.

5 Main Results

In this section, we present performance guarantees for Algorithm 1 initialized by Algorithm 2. Subsets of the following assumptions are used in the analyses.

(A1) Random basis: Let $\boldsymbol{\phi} = [\mathrm{vec}(\Phi_1)^\top, \ldots, \mathrm{vec}(\Phi_\mathrm{M})^\top]^\top$. Suppose that $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ is a subgaussian vector satisfying $\mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{\phi} = \mathbf{0}_{MKD\times 1}$ and $\mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{\phi}\boldsymbol{\phi}^\top = \boldsymbol{I}_{MKD}$.

(A2) Random noise: $\boldsymbol{w} = [\boldsymbol{w}_1^\top, \ldots, \boldsymbol{w}_M^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{ML}$ is a subgaussian vector with $\mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{w} = \mathbf{0}_{ML\times 1}$ and $\mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{w}\boldsymbol{w}^\top = \sigma_w^2 \boldsymbol{I}_{ML}$.

(A3) Random input: $\boldsymbol{x}$ is a subgaussian vector with $\mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{x} = \mathbf{0}_{L\times 1}$ and $\mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{x}^\top = \sigma_x^2 \boldsymbol{I}_L$.

Under (A1) and (A2), we define the signal-to-noise ratio by

$$\eta := \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \sum_{m=1}^M \|\boldsymbol{h}_m \circledast \boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2}{\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{w}} \sum_{m=1}^M \|\boldsymbol{w}_m\|_2^2} = \frac{K\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2}{ML\sigma_w^2}. \tag{15}$$

In the next theorem, we present our first main result, which provide performance guarantees for Algorithms 2 and 1 when the input $\boldsymbol{x}$ is a deterministic signal.

Theorem 5.1 (Deterministic Input)**.** *Suppose i) (A1) and (A2) hold; ii)* $\frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2} \leqslant 0.25$*; iii)* $\frac{\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2} \leqslant 2$*. Then there exist constants* $C_k > 0$ *for* $k = 1, \ldots, 9$ *that depend only on* $\boldsymbol{a} \in \mathbb{R}^M$ *and absolute constants* $\alpha, \gamma \in \mathbb{N}$ *for which the following holds: If*

$$(D+M)^2 \log^\gamma L \leqslant C_1 KM, \tag{16a}$$

$$(D+M) \log^\gamma L \leqslant C_2 K, \tag{16b}$$

$$\frac{L}{\log^\gamma L} \geqslant \eta^{-1} \left(\frac{C_3 (D+M)^3}{M} \vee C_4 K (D+M) \right), \tag{16c}$$

$$\frac{L}{\log^\gamma L} \geqslant C_5 \eta^{-2} \left(\frac{(D+M)^2}{MK} \vee \frac{D+M}{M} \right), \tag{16d}$$

then with probability $1 - L^{-\alpha}$*, Algorithm 1 initialized by Algorithm 2 converges linearly to*

$$\sin \angle(\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}, \boldsymbol{h}) \leqslant \frac{\log^\gamma L}{\sqrt{\eta L}} \left(\frac{C_6 (D+M)^{3/2}}{\sqrt{M}} \vee \frac{C_7 \sqrt{K(D+M)}}{\sqrt{M}} \right) \tag{17a}$$

$$+ \frac{\log^\gamma L}{\eta \sqrt{L}} \left(\frac{C_8 (D+M)}{\sqrt{MK}} \vee \frac{C_9 \sqrt{D+M}}{\sqrt{M}} \right). \tag{17b}$$

In particular, if $\boldsymbol{a}$ *satisfies*

$$M\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty \vee \sqrt{M}\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2 = O(\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1), \tag{18}$$

then the constants C_k*'s are upper bounded by absolute constants.*

The second assumption excludes extreme cases where $\boldsymbol{a} \in \mathbb{R}^M$ is spiky. The choice of constant 0.25 was arbitrary. It can be replaced by any positive constant strictly less than 1.

The third assumption is satisfied if the autocorrelation of $\boldsymbol{x}$ has small entries except the zero lag. Indeed, $\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is a Toeplitz matrix whose diagonal entries are $\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2$ and the off-diagonal entries

correspond to the autocorrelation of $\boldsymbol{x}$ with resect to circular shifts modulo L. By the Gershgorin disk theorem, if the off-diagonal entries have small magnitudes, the spectral norm is bounded accordingly. This property is often satisfied in practical applications. For example, in the channel estimation in underwater acoustics with passive sensors, the input signal $\boldsymbol{x}$ is noise-like and the autocorrelation is very small except the zero lag.

The requirements on $M + D$ and L in (16) becomes less stringent as $\boldsymbol{a} \in \mathbb{R}^M$ has less variation on its entries, i.e., the gains do not vary too much in channels. As stated in Theorem 5.1, in the special case when the channel gains are similar in the sense that $\boldsymbol{a}$ satisfies (18), the constants C_k's satisfy $C_k = O(1)$ for all $k = 1, \dots, 9$. Therefore, in this case, C_k's can be regarded as absolute constants. In this scenario, conditions in (16a) and (16c) dominate conditions in (16b) and (16d), respectively, and the first term of the upper bound on the estimation error in (17a) dominates the other term in (17b). Theorem 5.1 then shows that if the total number of unknown parameters $M + D$ in the bilinear model is small and the length L of the input $\boldsymbol{x}$ is large, Algorithm 1 provides stable estimate of the channel model parameters for finite L in the presence of noise. It is directly implied that the estimate by Algorithm 1 is consistent in the sense that the error vanishes as L increases. This non-asymptotic performance guarantee derived with the additional bilinear model is stronger than the previous asymptotic performance guarantee [14, 15].

In the next theorem, we show that if the input $\boldsymbol{x}$ is a random signal that satisfies (A3), the performance guarantee in Theorem 5.1 can be improved by relaxing the requirement and tightening the upper bound of the estimation error.

Theorem 5.2 (Random Input)**.** *Under the hypothesis of Theorem 5.1 except* $\frac{\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2} \leqslant 2$*, suppose (A3). Then the performance guarantee holds only with the following two changes.*

- *The lower bound in the right-hand-side of* (16c) *reduces by factor* K *to*

$$\frac{L}{\log^\gamma L} \geqslant \eta^{-1} \left(\frac{C_3 (D+M)^3}{MK} \vee C_4 (D+M) \right).$$

- *The first summand of the error bound in* (17a) *reduces by factor* $\sqrt{K}$ *to*

$$\frac{\log^\gamma L}{\sqrt{\eta L}} \left(\frac{C_6 (D+M)^{3/2}}{\sqrt{MK}} \vee \frac{C_7 \sqrt{D+M}}{\sqrt{M}} \right).$$

The proofs of Theorems theorems 5.1 and 5.2 are deferred to Section 7.

Remark 5.3. *The above theorems have suboptimal scaling of parameters. We used the concentration of a fourth order polynomial of Gaussian random variables and the naive union bound with the* ϵ*-net argument.*



(a) (b)

Figure 2: Reconstruction error as a function of L. Basis is i.i.d. Gaussian. $K = 100$, $M = 10$, $D = 5$, SNR $= 20$ dB. (a) Comparison of the FIR and FIR+bilinear models. (b) Zoom-in only for the FIR+bilinear model.

6 Numerical Results

In this section, we provide observation on empirical performance of the alternating cross convolution method in Algorithm 1 initialized by Algorithm 2. We also compare the alternating convolution method to the original cross convolution method by Xu et al. [14], which does not exploit the bilinear channel model, to demonstrate the gain from using a more restrictive channel model.

In our first experiment, we tested the algorithms on generic data where the basis $\mathbf{\Phi}$ is an i.i.d. Gaussian matrix. The input signal and noise are i.i.d. Gaussian too. We averaged the estimation error in the sine of the principal angle over 100 random instances. As shown in Figure 2(a), the alternating cross convolution method (labeled as "FIR+B") outperforms the original cross convolution method (labeled as "FIR") with much smaller estimation error. Although the estimation error by the original cross convolution method decreases with larger L, the error is still too large even when L is multiple of K by factor 20. Figure 2(b) demonstrates the empirical performance by the alternating cross convolution method only. The estimation error also decays as L increases, which is consistent with Theorem 5.2. Figure 3(a) compares the two algorithms as we vary the number of channels M. Again, the alternating cross convolution method outperforms with much smaller estimation error. Furthermore, as shown in Figure 3(b), the estimation error decays with larger M, which is what Theorem 5.2 predicts.

In our second experiment, we generated synthetic data in a realistic setup that emulates the channel estimation in underwater acoustics. The unknown channel impulse responses correspond to sampled versions of a known continuous function with unknown continuous-valued delays multiplied by unknown positive gains. In this particular application, the delay is known within error up to the



(a) (b)

Figure 3: Reconstruction error as a function of M. Basis is i.i.d. Gaussian. $K = 100$, $L = 500$, $D = 5$, SNR $= 20$ dB. (a) Comparison of the FIR and FIR+bilinear models. (b) Zoom-in only for the FIR+bilinear model.

sampling period a priori, but estimation with much higher accuracy is desirable. Furthermore, the delays in the channels are aligned along a simple geometric structure such as a straight line since they represent multiple reflection paths which are given as a function of the configuration of the sensor array. We introduce a bilinear model that separates gain and shape of each channel impulse response. The manifold-embedding linearization [20] efficiently models the shapes of unknown channel impulse responses as a low-dimensional subspace via principal component analysis. In this problem, the channel impulse responses are not well approximated as short FIR filters with known support. Therefore, the original cross convolution method is not applicable. On the other hand, the bilinear model adopted by the alternating cross convolution method allows the unknown channel impulse responses have zero entries at arbitrary locations whenever they are restricted within the window of length K. We repeated the experiment in Figure 2(b) and the result is demonstrated in Figure 4. We observe that the result shows the same trend of decaying estimation error with larger L, which is again consistent with the main theorems.

7 Proof of Main Results

In this section, we prove the main results in Theorems theorems 5.1 and 5.2. To this end, we first present a set of lemmas that bound noise related terms in the analysis in Section 7.1. Then lemmas that provide performance guarantees for the initialization by Algorithm 2 and iterative updates by Algorithm 1 follow in Section 7.2. By assembling these intermediate results, we provide the proofs of Theorems theorems 5.1 and 5.2 in Section 7.3.



Figure 4: Reconstruction error as a function of L. Basis is designed as the principal components of all possible realizations. $K = 300$, $M = 5$, $D = 4$, SNR $= 30$ dB.

7.1 Bounds on noise terms

In the proof of Theorems theorems 5.1 and 5.2, we will use upper bounds on the auto-correlation of the input $\boldsymbol{x}$ and noise terms $\{\boldsymbol{w}_m\}_{m=1}^M$ and on the cross-correlation among them. Specifically, we will derive upper bounds on the following quantities under subsets of the assumptions in (A1)–(A3).

- Signal auto-correlation
$$\rho_x := \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|.$$
- Signal-noise cross-correlations
$$\rho_{x,w} := \max_m \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|.$$
- Noise auto/cross-correlations
$$\rho_w := \max_m \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m} - \sigma_w^2 L \boldsymbol{I}_K\| \vee \max_{m \neq m'} \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\|.$$

Lemma 7.1. *Suppose (A2). Then*

$$\rho_w \lesssim \sigma_w^2 \sqrt{KL} \log^\gamma ML$$

holds with probability $1 - L^{-\alpha}$.

Proof of Lemma 7.1. Recall that $\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m} = \boldsymbol{S}_{[K]} \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m} \boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top$, i.e., $\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}$ is a submatrix of the Gramian of a random circulant matrix $\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}$. Therefore, by [24, Theorem 4.1], it follows that

$$\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m} - \sigma_w^2 L \boldsymbol{I}_K\| \leqslant \sigma_w^2 \sqrt{KL} (\log^4 L + \log M)$$

holds with probability $1 - 0.5M^{-1}L^{-4}$. In the original version of [24, Theorem 4.1], the upper bound applied to the spectral norm of all K-by-K principal submatrices of $\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}$. Indeed, the proof of [24, Theorem 4.1], the maximum spectral norm was computed as a supremum of a second order subgaussian process $\boldsymbol{w}_m^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \boldsymbol{w}_m$ indexed by K-sparse $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^L$. Specifically, the radii of the set $\{\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}} | \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{S}^{L-1}, \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_0 = K\}$ in the spectral and Frobenius norms and its covering number with respect to the spectral norm were computed.

Next, we turn to $\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\|$ for $m \neq m'$. By the assumption, $\mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}} = \boldsymbol{0}_{L\times L}$. On the other hand, the spectral norm is characterized by

$$\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\| = \max_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^L} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{w}_m \\ \boldsymbol{w}_{m'} \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{0}_{L\times L} & \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \\ \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}} & \boldsymbol{0}_{L\times L} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{w}_m \\ \boldsymbol{w}_{m'} \end{bmatrix} \middle| \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{S}^{L-1}, \mathrm{supp}(\boldsymbol{x}) = [K] \right\}.$$

Note that

$$\left\| \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{0}_{L\times L} & \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \\ \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}} & \boldsymbol{0}_{L\times L} \end{bmatrix} \right\| = \|\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|$$

and

$$\left\| \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{0}_{L\times L} & \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \\ \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}} & \boldsymbol{0}_{L\times L} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_{\mathrm{F}} = \sqrt{2}\|\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|_{\mathrm{F}}.$$

Therefore, similarly to [24, Theorem 4.1], by [24, Theorem 3.5], it follows that

$$\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\| \leqslant \sigma_w^2 \sqrt{KL}(\log^4 L + \log M)$$

holds with probability $1 - 0.5M^{-2}L^{-4}$. By taking the union bound over $m \in [M]$ and $m \neq m' \in [M]$, we completes the proof. □

The following lemma follows directly from the proof of Lemma 7.1 and we do not repeat the proof.

Lemma 7.2. *Suppose (A2) and (A3). Then*

$$\rho_{x,w} \lesssim \sigma_w \sqrt{KL} \log^\gamma ML$$

holds with probability $1 - L^{-\alpha}$.

Lemma 7.3. *Suppose (A3). Then*

$$\rho_x \lesssim \sigma_x^2 (L + \sqrt{KL} \log^\gamma L)$$

holds with probability $1 - L^{-\alpha}$

Proof of Lemma 7.3. By the triangle inequality, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\| \leqslant \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}} - \mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\| + \|\mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|,$$

where the first term is upper bounded by [24, Theorem 4.1] and the second term is computed by the fact that $\mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}} = \sigma_x^2 L \boldsymbol{I}_K$. This completes the proof. □

The next lemma provides an upper bound $\rho_{x,w}$ for an arbitrarily fixed $\boldsymbol{x}$.

Lemma 7.4. *Suppose (A2). Then*

$$\rho_{x,w} \lesssim \sigma_w K \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2 \log K \log L$$

holds with probability $1 - L^{-\alpha}$ *for an absolute constant* $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof of Lemma 7.4. Let B_2^K denote the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^K$ with respect to the ℓ_2 norm. The spectral norm of $\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}$ is characterized by

$$\begin{aligned}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\| &= \max_{\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{v}\in B_2^K} \boldsymbol{u}^\top \boldsymbol{S}_{[K]} \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m} \boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{v} \\ &= \max_{\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{v}\in B_2^K} \boldsymbol{x}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{u}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{v}} \boldsymbol{w}_m.\end{aligned}$$

Define

$$X_{\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{v}} := \boldsymbol{x}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{u}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{v}} \boldsymbol{w}_m = \langle \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{v}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{u}} \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{w}_m \rangle.$$

Then the spectral norm of $\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}$ is rewritten as the supremum of the subgaussian process $X_{\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{v}}$ as follows:

$$\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\| = \sup_{\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{v}\in B_2^K} X_{\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{v}}.$$

Let d denote the canonical metric for the subgaussian process given by

$$d((\boldsymbol{u}_1, \boldsymbol{v}_1), (\boldsymbol{u}_2, \boldsymbol{v}_2)) = \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\,|X_{\boldsymbol{u}_1,\boldsymbol{v}_1} - X_{\boldsymbol{u}_2,\boldsymbol{v}_2}|^2}.$$

Then, $d((\boldsymbol{u}_1, \boldsymbol{v}_1), (\boldsymbol{u}_2, \boldsymbol{v}_2))$ is given as

$$d((\boldsymbol{u}_1, \boldsymbol{v}_1), (\boldsymbol{u}_2, \boldsymbol{v}_2)) = \sigma_w \left\| (\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{v}_1}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{u}_1} - \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{v}_2}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{u}_2}) \boldsymbol{x} \right\|_2.$$

Let $\boldsymbol{F} \in \mathbb{C}^{L\times L}$ denote the unitary discrete Fourier transform matrix that satisfies $\boldsymbol{F}^*\boldsymbol{F} = \boldsymbol{I}_L$. Then, by the diagonalization of a circulant matrix using $\boldsymbol{F}$, $d((\boldsymbol{u}_1, \boldsymbol{v}_1), (\boldsymbol{u}_2, \boldsymbol{v}_2))$ is rewritten as

$$\sigma_w L \left\| \left(\mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{v}_1)^* \mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{u}_1) - \mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{v}_2)^* \mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{u}_2) \right) \boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{x} \right\|_2 \tag{19}$$

By [25, Theorem 2.2.27],

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{v}\in B_2^K} X_{\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{v}} \lesssim \sqrt{\log(1/p)}\gamma_2(B_2^K \times B_2^K, d) \tag{20}$$

with probability $1-p$, where $\gamma_2(B_2^K \times B_2^K, d)$ denotes Talagrand's γ_2 functional with respect to the canonical metric d.

By Dudley's theorem (cf. [26]),

$$\gamma_2(B_2^K \times B_2^K, d) \lesssim \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\log N(B_2^K \times B_2^K, d; \epsilon)}d\epsilon,$$

where $N(T, d; \epsilon)$ denotes the covering number with respect to the pseudo metric d.

We use an upper bound on d derived as follows. By the triangle inequality, the expression of $d((\boldsymbol{u}_1, \boldsymbol{v}_1), (\boldsymbol{u}_2, \boldsymbol{v}_2))$ in (19) is upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sigma_w L \left\| \left(\mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{v}_1)^* \mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{u}_1) - \mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{v}_1)^* \mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{u}_2) \right) \boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{x} \right\|_2 \\
&+ \sigma_w L \left\| \left(\mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{v}_1)^* \mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{u}_2) - \mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{v}_2)^* \mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{u}_2) \right) \boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{x} \right\|_2 \\
&= \sigma_w L \left\| \mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{v}_1)^* \mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top (\boldsymbol{u}_1 - \boldsymbol{u}_2)) \boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{x} \right\|_2 + \sigma_w L \left\| \mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top (\boldsymbol{v}_1 - \boldsymbol{v}_2))^* \mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{u}_2) \boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{x} \right\|_2 \\
&\leqslant \sigma_w L \|\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{v}_1\|_\infty \|\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top (\boldsymbol{u}_1 - \boldsymbol{u}_2)\|_\infty \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2 + \sigma_w L \|\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{u}_2\|_\infty \|\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top (\boldsymbol{v}_1 - \boldsymbol{v}_2)\|_\infty \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2 \\
&\leqslant \sigma_w \sqrt{KL} \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2 \left(\|\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top (\boldsymbol{u}_1 - \boldsymbol{u}_2)\|_\infty + \|\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top (\boldsymbol{v}_1 - \boldsymbol{v}_2)\|_\infty \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step holds since

$$\|\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top\|_{\ell_2^K \to \ell_\infty^L} \leqslant \|\boldsymbol{F}\|_{\ell_1^L \to \ell_\infty^L} \|\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top\|_{\ell_2^K \to \ell_1^L} \leqslant \sqrt{\frac{K}{L}}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^\infty \sqrt{\log N(B_2^K \times B_2^K, d; \epsilon)}d\epsilon &\leqslant 2\int_0^\infty \sqrt{\log N(\sqrt{L}\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top B_2^K, 2\sigma_w \sqrt{K}\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2 \|\cdot\|_\infty; \epsilon)}d\epsilon \\
&\leqslant 4\sigma_w \sqrt{K}\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2 \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\log N(\sqrt{L}\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top B_2^K, \|\cdot\|_\infty; \epsilon)}d\epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

It has been shown (see e.g., [27, 28]) that the last term is known to be upper bounded by

$$\int_0^\infty \sqrt{\log N(\sqrt{L}\boldsymbol{F}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top B_2^K, \|\cdot\|_\infty; \epsilon)}d\epsilon \lesssim \sqrt{K}\log K \log L.$$

The proof completes by applying the above bounds to (20). □

7.2 Performance guarantees for initialization and iterative updates

The following lemma provides a performance guarantee for the initialization by Algorithm 2.

Lemma 7.5 (Initialization)**.** *Suppose (A1). Let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}$ denote the initialization given by Algorithm 2. Let $\boldsymbol{w} = [\boldsymbol{w}_1^\top, \dots, \boldsymbol{w}_M^\top]^\top$. There exist absolute constants $\alpha, \gamma \in \mathbb{N}$ such that with probability $1 - L^{-\alpha}$, the angle between $\boldsymbol{u}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}$ is bounded by*

$$\begin{aligned}\sin\angle(\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}, \boldsymbol{u}) \leqslant \frac{\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2} \left(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty (D+M)^2}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1^2 K} \vee \frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty (D+M)}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1 K} \vee \frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2 \sqrt{D+M}}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1 \sqrt{K}} \right) \log^2 L \\ + \frac{\rho_{x,w}}{\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2} \left(\frac{M \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty (D+M)^{3/2}}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1^2 K^{3/2}} \vee \frac{\sqrt{M(D+M)}}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1 K} \right) \log^{3/2} L \\ + \frac{\rho_w}{\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2} \left(\frac{M(D+M)}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1^2 K^2} \vee \frac{M\sqrt{D+M}}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1^2 K^{3/2}} \right) \log L.\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 7.5. See Section 8.1 □

In Lemma 7.5, the noise terms $\{\boldsymbol{w}_m\}_{m=1}^M$ are treated as deterministic vectors. The signal-noise cross term $\rho_{x,w}$ in the upper bound varies depending on whether the input signal $\boldsymbol{x}$ satisfies (A3) or not. The next corollary, obtained by combining Lemmas lemmas 7.1, 7.4 and 7.5, provides an error bound in the latter case where $\boldsymbol{x}$ is arbitrarily fixed.

Corollary 7.6. *Under the hypothesis of Lemma 7.5, suppose (A2). There exist absolute constants $\alpha, \gamma \in \mathbb{N}$ such that with probability $1 - L^{-\alpha}$, the angle between $\boldsymbol{u}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}$ is bounded by*

$$\begin{aligned}\sin\angle(\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}, \boldsymbol{u}) \lesssim \frac{\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2} \left(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty (D+M)^2}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1^2 K} \vee \frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty (D+M)}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1 K} \vee \frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2 \sqrt{D+M}}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1 \sqrt{K}} \right) \log^\gamma L \\ + \frac{\log^\gamma L}{\sqrt{\eta L}} \left(\frac{\sqrt{M} \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty (D+M)^{3/2}}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1^2} \vee \frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2 \sqrt{K(D+M)}}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1} \right) \\ + \frac{\log^\gamma L}{\eta \sqrt{L}} \left(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2 (D+M)}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1^2 \sqrt{K}} \vee \frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2 \sqrt{D+M}}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1^2} \right).\end{aligned}$$

The next lemma provides a performance guarantee for the update of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}$ in Algorithm 1.

Lemma 7.7 (Update of Channel Gains)**.** *Suppose (A1). Let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}$ be the estimate of $\boldsymbol{a}$ computed from $\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}$ by algorithms 1 to 1 of Algorithm 1. There exist absolute constants $C_1 > 0$ and $\alpha, \gamma \in \mathbb{N}$ such that with probability $1 - L^{-\alpha}$, the angle between $\boldsymbol{a}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}$ is bounded by*

$$\sin\angle(\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}, \boldsymbol{a}) \leqslant a_1 \tan\angle(\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}, \boldsymbol{u}) + b_1,$$

where a_1 and b_1 are bounded respectively by

$$a_1 \leqslant \frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty^2}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2} + C_1 \frac{\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2} \left(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_4^2 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty (D+M)^2}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^3 K} \vee \frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty \sqrt{D+M}}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2 \sqrt{K}} \right),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} b_1 \lesssim\ & \frac{\max_m |\sigma_w^2 L - \|\boldsymbol{w}_m\|_2^2|}{\cos^2 \angle(\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}, \boldsymbol{u}) K \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2} \\ & + \frac{\rho_{x,w}}{\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2} \left(\frac{(\sqrt{M}\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty^2 \vee \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2 \vee \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty)((D+M)\log L)^{3/2}}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^3 K^{3/2}} \vee \frac{\sqrt{(D+M)\log L}}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2 K} \right) \\ & + \frac{\rho_w}{\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2} \left(\frac{M\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty (D+M)\log L}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^3 K^2} \vee \frac{M\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty \sqrt{(D+M)\log L}}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^3 K^{3/2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 7.7. See Section 8.2 □

Similarly to Corollary 7.6, by combining Lemmas lemmas 7.1, 7.4 and 7.7, we get the following corollary of Lemma 7.7, which provides an error bound in updating $\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}$ when $\boldsymbol{x}$ is arbitrarily fixed.

Corollary 7.8. *Under the hypothesis of Lemma 7.7, suppose (A2). There exist absolute constants $\alpha, \gamma \in \mathbb{N}$ such that with probability $1 - L^{-\alpha}$, the angle between $\boldsymbol{a}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}$ is bounded by*

$$\sin \angle(\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}, \boldsymbol{a}) \leqslant a_1 \tan \angle(\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}, \boldsymbol{u}) + b_1,$$

where a_1 is bounded by

$$a_1 \leqslant \frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty^2}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2} + C_1 \frac{\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2} \left(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_4^2 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty (D+M)^2}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^3 K} \vee \frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty \sqrt{D+M}}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2 \sqrt{K}} \right) \log^\gamma L,$$

for an absolute constant $C_1 > 0$, and b_1 is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} b_1 \lesssim\ & \frac{\sqrt{\log L}}{\cos^2 \angle(\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}, \boldsymbol{u}) M \eta \sqrt{L}} \\ & + \frac{\log^\gamma L}{\sqrt{\eta L}} \left(\frac{(\sqrt{M}\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty^2 \vee \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2 \vee \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty)(D+M)^{3/2}}{\sqrt{M}\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2} \vee \frac{\sqrt{K(D+M)}}{\sqrt{M}} \right) \\ & + \frac{\log^\gamma L}{\eta \sqrt{L}} \left(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty (D+M)}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2 \sqrt{K}} \vee \frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty \sqrt{D+M}}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

The next lemma provides a performance guarantee for the update of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}$ in Algorithm 1.

Lemma 7.9 (Update of Subspace Coefficients)**.** *Suppose (A1). Let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}$ be the estimate of $\boldsymbol{u}$ computed from $\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}$ by algorithms 1 to 1 of Algorithm 1. Suppose that*

$$\sin \angle(\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}, \boldsymbol{a}) \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}}.$$

There exist absolute constants $C_1 > 0$ and $\alpha, \gamma \in \mathbb{N}$ such that with probability $1 - L^{-\alpha}$, the angle between $\boldsymbol{u}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}$ is bounded by

$$\sin \angle(\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}, \boldsymbol{u}) \leqslant a_2 \tan \angle(\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}, \boldsymbol{a}) + b_2,$$

where a_2 and b_2 are bounded respectively by

$$\begin{aligned} a_2 \lesssim\, & C_1 \frac{\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2} \left(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_4^2 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty (D+M)^2}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^3 K} \vee \frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty (D+M)}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2 K} \vee \frac{(\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_4^2 \vee \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty)\sqrt{D+M}}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2 \sqrt{K}} \right) \log^2 L \\ & + \frac{\rho_{x,w}}{\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2} \left(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty (D+M)^{3/2}}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^3 K^{3/2}} \vee \frac{\sqrt{D+M}}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2 K} \right) \log^{3/2} L, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} b_2 \lesssim\, & \frac{\max_m |\sigma_w^2 L - \|\boldsymbol{w}_m\|_2^2|}{\cos^2 \widehat{\vartheta} K \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2} \\ & + \frac{\rho_{x,w}}{\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2} \left(\frac{(\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2 \vee \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty) \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty (D+M)^{3/2}}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^4 K^{3/2}} \vee \frac{\sqrt{D+M}}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2 K} \right) \log^{3/2} L \\ & + \frac{\rho_w}{\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2} \left(\frac{M \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty^2 (D+M)}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^4 K^2} \vee \frac{M \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_4^2 \sqrt{D+M}}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^4 K^{3/2}} \right) \log L. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 7.9. See Section 8.3 □

Again, similarly to Corollaries 7.6 and 7.10, by combining Lemmas lemmas 7.1, 7.4 and 7.9, we get the following corollary of Lemma 7.9, which provides an error bound in updating $\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}$ when $\boldsymbol{x}$ is arbitrarily fixed.

Corollary 7.10. *Under the hypothesis of Lemma 7.9, suppose (A2). There exist absolute constants $\alpha, \gamma \in \mathbb{N}$ such that with probability $1 - L^{-\alpha}$, the angle between $\boldsymbol{u}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}$ is bounded by*

$$\sin \angle(\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}, \boldsymbol{u}) \leqslant a_2 \tan \angle(\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}, \boldsymbol{a}) + b_2,$$

where a_2 is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} a_2 \lesssim\, & C_1 \frac{\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2} \left(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_4^2 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty (D+M)^2}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^3 K} \vee \frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty (D+M)}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2 K} \vee \frac{(\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_4^2 \vee \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty)\sqrt{D+M}}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2 \sqrt{K}} \right) \log^2 L \\ & + \frac{\log^\gamma L}{\sqrt{\eta L}} \left(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty (D+M)^{3/2}}{\sqrt{M} \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2} \vee \frac{\sqrt{K(D+M)}}{\sqrt{M}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and b_2 is bounded by

$$
\begin{aligned}
b_2 \lesssim\ & \frac{K \max_m |\sigma_w^2 L - \|\boldsymbol{w}_m\|_2^2|}{\cos^2 \widehat{\vartheta} K^2 \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2} \\
& + \frac{\log^\gamma L}{\sqrt{\eta L}} \left(\frac{(\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2 \vee \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty) \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty (D+M)^{3/2}}{\sqrt{M} \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^3} \vee \frac{\sqrt{K(D+M)}}{\sqrt{M}} \right) \\
& + \frac{\log^\gamma L}{\eta \sqrt{L}} \left(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty^2 (D+M)}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2 \sqrt{K}} \vee \frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_4^2 \sqrt{D+M}}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2} \right).
\end{aligned}
$$

7.3 Proof of Theorems theorems 5.1 and 5.2

Now we are ready to prove the main theorems.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Under (A1) and (A2), by Corollary 7.6, the assumption of Theorem 5.1 implies that the error in the initialization is $O(M^{-1/2})$. Furthermore, Corollaries 7.8 and 7.10 hold with a_1 and a_2, which are less than a small positive constant strictly below 1. Combining the above results, we obtain the following conclusion. There exist absolute constants $\widetilde{C}_k$ for $k = 1, \ldots, 5$ and $\alpha, \gamma \in \mathbb{N}$ for which the following holds: If the dimension parameters L, K, M, and D satisfy

$$
\begin{aligned}
& (D+M)^2 \log^\gamma L \leqslant \widetilde{C}_1 K \left(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1^2}{\sqrt{M} \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty} \wedge \frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^3}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_4^2 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty} \right), \\
& (D+M) \log^\gamma L \leqslant \widetilde{C}_2 K \left(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1}{\sqrt{M} \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty} \wedge \frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1^2}{M \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2} \wedge \frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty} \wedge \frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^4}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_4^4} \wedge \frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty^2} \right), \\
& \frac{L}{\log^\gamma L} \geqslant \eta^{-1} \widetilde{C}_3 \left[\left(\frac{M^2 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty^2}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1^4} \vee \frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1^2 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty^2}{M \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^4} \right) (D+M)^3 \vee K(D+M) \right], \\
& \frac{L}{\log^\gamma L} \geqslant \eta^{-2} \widetilde{C}_4 \frac{M \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^4}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1^4} \left(\frac{(D+M)^2}{K} \vee (D+M) \right),
\end{aligned}
$$

for the given channel gains in $\boldsymbol{a}$ and signal-to-noise ratio η, then with probability $1 - L^{-\alpha}$, Algorithm 1 initialized by Algorithm 2 converges linearly to

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sin \angle(\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}, \boldsymbol{h}) \leqslant\ & \widetilde{C}_5 \frac{\log^\gamma L}{\sqrt{\eta L}} \left(\frac{(\sqrt{M} \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty^2 \vee \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2 \vee \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty) \sqrt{K} (D+M)^{3/2}}{\sqrt{M} \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2} \vee \frac{K \sqrt{D+M}}{\sqrt{M}} \right) \\
& + \widetilde{C}_5 \frac{\log^\gamma L}{\eta \sqrt{L}} \left(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty (D+M)}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2 \sqrt{K}} \vee \frac{(\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty \vee \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_4^2) \sqrt{D+M}}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{21}
$$

We completes the proof by defining the constants C_k for $k = 1, \dots, 9$ as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
C_1 &= \widetilde{C}_1 \left(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1^2}{M^{3/2}\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty} \wedge \frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^3}{M\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_4^2\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty} \right), \\
C_2 &= \widetilde{C}_2 \left(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1}{\sqrt{M}\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty} \wedge \frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1^2}{M\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2} \wedge \frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty} \wedge \frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^4}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_4^4} \wedge \frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty^2} \right), \\
C_3 &= \widetilde{C}_3 \left(\frac{M^3\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty^2}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1^4} \vee \frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1^2\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty^2}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^4} \right), \\
C_4 &= \widetilde{C}_3, \\
C_5 &= \frac{\widetilde{C}_4 M^2\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^4}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1^4}, \\
C_6 &= \widetilde{C}_5 \frac{\sqrt{M}\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty^2 \vee \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2 \vee \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2}, \\
C_7 &= \widetilde{C}_5, \\
C_8 &= \frac{\widetilde{C}_5\sqrt{M}\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2}, \\
C_9 &= \frac{\widetilde{C}_5\sqrt{M}(\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty \vee \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_4^2)}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2}.
\end{aligned}
$$

□

Proof of Theorem 5.2. The proof is almost identical to that of Theorem 5.1. We only need analog of Corollaries 7.6, 7.8, and 7.10, which are obtained by using Lemma 7.2 instead of Lemma 7.4. Recall that the upper bound on $\rho_{x,w}$ by Lemma 7.2 is smaller by factor $\sqrt{K}$ than that by Lemma 7.4. Accordingly, the signal-noise cross term in the error bound by Theorem 5.2 is smaller by factor K compared to the corresponding part in Theorem 5.1. □

8 Proof of Technical Lemmas

8.1 Proof of Lemma 7.5

Recall that Algorithm 2 computed $\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}$ as the first dominant eigenvector of the following matrix:

$$
\boldsymbol{Q} = \sum_{m,m'=1}^{M} \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{m'}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_m}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_{m'}} \boldsymbol{\Phi}_m - \sum_{m=1}^{M} \hat{\sigma}_w^2 L \boldsymbol{\Phi}_m^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}_m.
$$

Let $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m = \boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}_m$. Then $\boldsymbol{Q}$ is rewritten with circulant matrices as

$$
\boldsymbol{Q} = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m^\top (\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{y}_m}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{y}_m} - \sigma_w^2 L \boldsymbol{I}_L) \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m + \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{\substack{m'=1 \\ m' \neq m}}^{M} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{y}_m}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{y}_{m'}} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m.
$$

We will use this alternative expression for the ease of computation.

Next, we decompose $\boldsymbol{Q}$ as $\boldsymbol{Q} = \boldsymbol{Q}_1 + \boldsymbol{Q}_2 + \boldsymbol{Q}_3 + \boldsymbol{Q}_4$, where $\boldsymbol{Q}_1, \boldsymbol{Q}_2, \boldsymbol{Q}_3, \boldsymbol{Q}_4$ are given respectively by

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{Q}_1 &= \sum_{m,m'=1}^{M} a_m a_{m'} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \boldsymbol{u}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \boldsymbol{C}_{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'} \boldsymbol{u}} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m, \\
\boldsymbol{Q}_2 &= \sum_{m,m'=1}^{M} a_m \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \boldsymbol{u}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m, \\
\boldsymbol{Q}_3 &= \sum_{m,m'=1}^{M} a_{m'} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \boldsymbol{C}_{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'} \boldsymbol{u}} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m, \\
\boldsymbol{Q}_4 &= \sum_{m=1}^{M} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m^\top (\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m} - \sigma_w^2 L \boldsymbol{I}_L) \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m + \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{\substack{m'=1 \\ m' \neq m}}^{M} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'}.
\end{aligned}$$

Under (A1), the expectation of $\boldsymbol{Q}_1, \boldsymbol{Q}_2, \boldsymbol{Q}_3, \boldsymbol{Q}_4$ are given respectively by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{Q}_1 = \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2 K^2 \boldsymbol{I}_D + \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 (K^2 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1^2 + K \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2) \boldsymbol{u}\boldsymbol{u}^\top, \\
&\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{Q}_2 = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{Q}_3 = \boldsymbol{0}_{D \times D}, \\
&\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{Q}_4 = \left(\sum_{m=1}^{M} (\|\boldsymbol{w}_m\|^2 - \sigma_w^2 L) + \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{\substack{m'=1 \\ m' \neq m}}^{M} \boldsymbol{w}_m^\top \boldsymbol{w}_{m'} \right) \boldsymbol{I}_D.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\boldsymbol{u}/\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2$ is the first dominant eigenvector of $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{Q}$. Therefore, we consider $\boldsymbol{Q}$ as a perturbed matrix from $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{Q}$ with additive perturbation given by $\boldsymbol{Q} - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{Q}$. Note that the gap between the first two largest eigenvalues of $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{Q}$ is

$$\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 (K^2 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1^2 + K \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2).$$

Then by Davis-Kahan $\sin\theta$ theorem [23], the error in $\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}$ is upper bounded by

$$\sin \angle(\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}, \boldsymbol{u}) \leqslant \frac{\|\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{u})^\perp} (\boldsymbol{Q} - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{Q}) \boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{u})}\|}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 (K^2 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1^2 + K \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2)}. \tag{22}$$

The rest of the proof is devoted to derive tail bounds for

$$\|\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{u})^\perp} (\boldsymbol{Q}_k - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{Q}_k) \boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{u})}\| = \frac{\|\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{u})^\perp} (\boldsymbol{Q}_k - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{Q}_k) \boldsymbol{u}\|_2}{\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}$$

for $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$.

First, we consider the perturbation due to $\boldsymbol{Q}_1$. We decompose $\boldsymbol{Q}_1$ as $\boldsymbol{Q}_1^{\mathrm{diag}} + \boldsymbol{Q}_1^{\mathrm{offd}}$, where

$$\boldsymbol{Q}_1^{\mathrm{diag}} = \sum_{m=1}^{M} a_m^2 \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \boldsymbol{u}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \boldsymbol{C}_{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \boldsymbol{u}} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m,$$
$$\boldsymbol{Q}_1^{\mathrm{offd}} = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{\substack{m'=1 \\ m' \neq m}}^{M} a_m a_{m'} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \boldsymbol{u}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \boldsymbol{C}_{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'} \boldsymbol{u}} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m.$$

Then the following lemmas provide corresponding tail bounds.

Lemma 8.1. *Let $\epsilon \in (0,1)$. There exists an absolute constant C such that with probability $1-p$ $\|\boldsymbol{Q}_1^{\mathrm{diag}} - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{Q}_1^{\mathrm{diag}}\|$ is upper bounded by the maximum of*

$$\frac{CK\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\| \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty^2 \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2}{1-2\epsilon} \left\{ \log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right) + D \log\left(1 + \frac{2}{\epsilon}\right) \right\}^2,$$

and

$$\frac{CK^{3/2}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\| \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_4^2 \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2}{1-2\epsilon} \left\{ \log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right) + D \log\left(1 + \frac{2}{\epsilon}\right) \right\}^{1/2}.$$

Lemma 8.2. *Let $\epsilon \in (0,1)$. There exists an absolute constant C such that with probability $1-p$ $\|\boldsymbol{Q}_1^{\mathrm{offd}} - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{Q}_1^{\mathrm{offd}}\|$ is upper bounded by the maximum of*

$$\frac{CK\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\| \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2}{1-2\epsilon} \left\{ \log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right) + 2D \log\left(1 + \frac{2}{\epsilon}\right) \right\}^2,$$

$$\frac{CK\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\| \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2}{1-2\epsilon} \left\{ \log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right) + 2D \log\left(1 + \frac{2}{\epsilon}\right) \right\},$$

and

$$\frac{CK^{3/2}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\| \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2}{1-2\epsilon} \left\{ \log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right) + D \log\left(1 + \frac{2}{\epsilon}\right) \right\}^{1/2}.$$

Next, we consider the perturbation due to $\boldsymbol{Q}_2$ and $\boldsymbol{Q}_3$. By symmetry, it suffices to consider $\boldsymbol{Q}_2$ only. Similarly to the case of $\boldsymbol{Q}_1$, we decompose $\boldsymbol{Q}_2$ as $\boldsymbol{Q}_2^{\mathrm{diag}} + \boldsymbol{Q}_2^{\mathrm{offd}}$, where

$$\boldsymbol{Q}_2^{\mathrm{diag}} = \sum_{m=1}^{M} a_m \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \boldsymbol{u}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m,$$
$$\boldsymbol{Q}_2^{\mathrm{offd}} = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{\substack{m'=1 \\ m' \neq m}}^{M} a_m \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \boldsymbol{u}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m.$$

Then the following lemmas provide corresponding tail bounds.

Lemma 8.3. *Let $\epsilon \in (0,1)$. There exists an absolute constant C such that with probability $1-p$*

$\|\boldsymbol{Q}_2^{\text{diag}} - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{Q}_2^{\text{diag}}\|$ *is upper bounded by the maximum of*

$$\frac{C\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty\sqrt{K}\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+2D\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{3/2},$$

and

$$\frac{C\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2 K\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+2D\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{1/2}.$$

Lemma 8.4. *Let $\epsilon \in (0,1)$. There exists an absolute constant C such that with probability $1-p$ $\|\boldsymbol{Q}_2^{\text{offd}} - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{Q}_2^{\text{offd}}\|$ is upper bounded by the maximum of*

$$\frac{C\sqrt{K}M\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+2D\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{3/2},$$

and

$$\frac{CK\sqrt{M}\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+2D\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{1/2}.$$

Lastly, $\boldsymbol{Q}_4$ is decompose as $\boldsymbol{Q}_4^{\text{diag}} + \boldsymbol{Q}_4^{\text{offd}}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{Q}_4^{\text{diag}} &= \sum_{m=1}^{M}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m^\top(\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}-\sigma_w^2 L\boldsymbol{I}_L)\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m,\\ \boldsymbol{Q}_4^{\text{offd}} &= \sum_{m=1}^{M}\sum_{\substack{m'=1\\ m'\neq m}}^{M}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'}^\top\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m.\end{aligned}$$

Then the following lemmas provide corresponding tail bounds.

Lemma 8.5. *Let $\epsilon \in (0,1)$. There exists an absolute constant C such that with probability $1-p$ $\|\boldsymbol{Q}_4^{\text{diag}} - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{Q}_4^{\text{diag}}\|$ is upper bounded by the maximum of*

$$\frac{C\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}-\sigma_w^2 L\boldsymbol{I}_K\|}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+D\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\},$$

and

$$\frac{C\sqrt{M}\sqrt{K}\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}-\sigma_w^2 L\boldsymbol{I}_K\|}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+D\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{1/2}.$$

Lemma 8.6. *Let $\epsilon \in (0,1)$. There exists an absolute constant C such that with probability $1-p$ $\|\boldsymbol{Q}_4^{\text{offd}} - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{Q}_4^{\text{offd}}\|$ is upper bounded by the maximum of*

$$\frac{CM\max_{m\neq m'\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\|}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+2D\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\},$$

or

$$\frac{CM\sqrt{K}\max_{m\neq m'\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\|}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+2D\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{1/2}.$$

Applying the results in the above lemmas to (22) completes the proof of Lemma 7.5. The proofs of Lemmas lemmas 8.1 to 8.6 are almost identical. Essentially, each lemma is a direct corollary of the corresponding result in Appendix. Therefore, we provide only the proof of Lemma 8.1.

Proof of Lemma 8.1. Let

$$h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{v}) = \sum_{m=1}^{M} a_m^2 \|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \boldsymbol{v} \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \boldsymbol{u} \circledast \boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2.$$

Then,

$$\|\boldsymbol{Q}_1^{\mathrm{diag}} - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{Q}_1^{\mathrm{diag}}\| = \sup_{\boldsymbol{v}\in\mathbb{S}^{D-1}} \left| h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{v}) - \mathbb{E} h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{v}) \right|.$$

For a fixed $\boldsymbol{v} \in \mathbb{S}^{D-1}$, by Lemma C.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}(|h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{v}) - \mathbb{E} h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{v})| \geqslant t) \\
&\leqslant 2\exp\left(- C \min\left\{ \left(\frac{t}{32\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_4^2 K^{3/2} \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\| \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2} \right)^2, \right.\right. \\
&\qquad \left.\left. \frac{t}{32\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty^2 K \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\| \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2}, \left(\frac{t}{32\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty^2 K \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\| \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2} \right)^{1/2} \right\} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Computing the supremum with the ϵ-net argument is now standard (e.g., [29], [30]).

Let $\mathcal{N}_\epsilon$ denote the ϵ-net on the unit sphere $\mathbb{S}^{D-1}$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then,

$$|\mathcal{N}_\epsilon| \leqslant \left(1 + \frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)^d.$$

Note that $h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{v})$ is written as a quadratic form $\boldsymbol{v}^\top \boldsymbol{M} \boldsymbol{v}$ for a positive semidefinite matrix $\boldsymbol{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$, and $\sup_{\boldsymbol{v}\in\mathbb{S}^{D-1}} h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{v}) = \|\boldsymbol{M}\|$. Therefore, by [30, Lemma 5.4], we have

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{v}\in\mathbb{S}^{D-1}} \left| h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{v}) - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{v}) \right| \leqslant (1-2\epsilon)^{-1} \sup_{\boldsymbol{v}\in\mathcal{N}_\epsilon} \left| h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{v}) - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{v}) \right|.$$

We apply the union bound as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{\boldsymbol{v}\in\mathbb{S}^{D-1}} \left| h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{v}) - \mathbb{E} h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{v}) \right| \geqslant t \right) \\
&\leqslant \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{\boldsymbol{v}\in\mathcal{N}_\epsilon} \left| h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{v}) - \mathbb{E} h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{v}) \right| \geqslant (1-2\epsilon)t \right) \\
&\leqslant |\mathcal{N}_\epsilon| \sup_{\boldsymbol{v}\in\mathcal{N}_\epsilon} \mathbb{P}\left(\left| h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{v}) - \mathbb{E} h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{v}) \right| \geqslant (1-2\epsilon)t \right).
\end{aligned}$$

□

8.2 Proof of Lemma 7.7

Recall that Algorithm 1 updates $\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}$ from a given $\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}$ as the least dominant eigenvector of the following matrix:

$$\boldsymbol{\Xi} = \boldsymbol{V}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top (\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{y}}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{y}} - \hat{\sigma}_w^2 (M-1) L \boldsymbol{I}_{MK}) \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{V}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}$$

Let $\widehat{\theta}$ denote the principal angle between $\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}$ and $\boldsymbol{u}$ given by

$$\widehat{\theta} = \cos^{-1}\left(\frac{|\boldsymbol{u}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}|}{\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2 \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2} \right) \in [0, \pi/2).$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2 = 1$.

Note that $\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}$ is decomposed as

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}} = \boldsymbol{u}_{\|} + \boldsymbol{u}_{\perp},$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{u}_{\|} = \frac{\boldsymbol{u}\boldsymbol{u}^\top}{\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2} \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}} \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{u}_{\perp} = \left(\boldsymbol{I}_D - \frac{\boldsymbol{u}\boldsymbol{u}^\top}{\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2} \right) \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}.$$

Then it follows that $\|\boldsymbol{u}_{\|}\|_2 = \cos\widehat{\theta}$ and $\|\boldsymbol{u}_{\perp}\|_2 = \sin\widehat{\theta}$. Furthermore, $\boldsymbol{V}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}$ is decomposed as $\boldsymbol{V}_{\boldsymbol{u}_{\|}} + \boldsymbol{V}_{\boldsymbol{u}_{\perp}}$.

Let $\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}$ denote the noiseless version of $\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{y}}$ obtained by letting $\boldsymbol{w}_m = \boldsymbol{0}_{L\times 1}$ for all $m \in [M]$. Let $\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}} = \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{y}} - \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}$. Then $\boldsymbol{\Xi}$ is decomposed as $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_1 + \boldsymbol{\Xi}_2 + \boldsymbol{\Xi}_3 + \boldsymbol{\Xi}_4$, where $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_1, \boldsymbol{\Xi}_2, \boldsymbol{\Xi}_3, \boldsymbol{\Xi}_4$ are given respectively by

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{\Xi}_1 &= \boldsymbol{V}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}} \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{V}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}, \\
\boldsymbol{\Xi}_2 &= \boldsymbol{V}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}} \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{V}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}, \\
\boldsymbol{\Xi}_3 &= \boldsymbol{V}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}} \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{V}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}, \\
\boldsymbol{\Xi}_4 &= \boldsymbol{V}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top (\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}} - \sigma_w^2 (M-1) L \boldsymbol{I}_{ML}) \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{V}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

We further decompose $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_1$ as $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,1} + \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,2} + \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,3} + \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,4}$, where $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,1}, \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,2}, \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,3}, \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,4}$ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,1} &= \boldsymbol{V}_{\boldsymbol{u}_{\|}}^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}} \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{V}_{\boldsymbol{u}_{\|}}, \\
\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,2} &= \boldsymbol{V}_{\boldsymbol{u}_{\|}}^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}} \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{V}_{\boldsymbol{u}_{\perp}}, \\
\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,3} &= \boldsymbol{V}_{\boldsymbol{u}_{\perp}}^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}} \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{V}_{\boldsymbol{u}_{\|}}, \\
\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,4} &= \boldsymbol{V}_{\boldsymbol{u}_{\perp}}^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}} \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{V}_{\boldsymbol{u}_{\perp}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Under (A1), the expectations are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,1} &= \cos^2\widehat{\theta}K^2\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2\boldsymbol{I}_M - \cos^2\widehat{\theta}K^2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2\boldsymbol{a}\boldsymbol{a}^\top,\\
\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,2} &= \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,3} = \boldsymbol{0}_{M\times M},\\
\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,4} &= \sin^2\widehat{\theta}K^2\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2\boldsymbol{I}_M - \sin^2\widehat{\theta}K^2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2\mathrm{diag}(|\boldsymbol{a}|^2),\\
\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{2} &= \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{3} = \boldsymbol{0}_{M\times M},\\
\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{4} &= K\mathrm{diag}\{(\sigma_w^2L - \|\boldsymbol{w}_m\|_2^2)_{m=1}^M\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\boldsymbol{a}/\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2$ is the least dominant eigenvector of $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Xi}_1 + \sin^2\widehat{\theta}K^2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2\mathrm{diag}(|\boldsymbol{a}|^2)$. Therefore, we consider $\boldsymbol{\Xi}$ as a perturbed matrix from $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Xi}_1 + \sin^2\widehat{\theta}K^2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2\mathrm{diag}(|\boldsymbol{a}|^2)$ with additive perturbation given by $\boldsymbol{\Xi} - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Xi}_1 - \sin^2\widehat{\theta}K^2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2\mathrm{diag}(|\boldsymbol{a}|^2)$. Note that the gap between the first two largest eigenvalues of $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Xi}_1 + \sin^2\widehat{\theta}K^2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2\mathrm{diag}(|\boldsymbol{a}|^2)$ is $\cos^2\widehat{\theta}K^2\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2$. Then by Davis-Kahan $\sin\theta$ theorem [23], the error in $\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}$ is upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
\sin\angle(\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}},\boldsymbol{a}) \leqslant\ & \frac{\sum_{k=1}^4\|\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{a})^\perp}(\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,k} - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,k})\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{a})}\|}{\cos^2\widehat{\theta}K^2\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2}\\
&+ \frac{\sum_{k=2}^4\|\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{a})^\perp}(\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{k} - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{k})\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{a})}\|}{\cos^2\widehat{\theta}K^2\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2}\\
&+ \frac{\sin^2\widehat{\theta}K^2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{a})^\perp}\mathrm{diag}(|\boldsymbol{a}|^2)\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{a})}\|}{\cos^2\widehat{\theta}K^2\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2}\\
&+ \frac{K\|\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{a})^\perp}\mathrm{diag}\{(\sigma_w^2L - \|\boldsymbol{w}_m\|_2^2)_{m=1}^M\}\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{a})}\|}{\cos^2\widehat{\theta}K^2\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

The last two terms in (23) are bounded by

$$\frac{\tan^2\widehat{\theta}\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty^2}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2} + \frac{\max_m|\sigma_w^2L - \|\boldsymbol{w}_m\|_2^2|}{\cos^2\widehat{\theta}K\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2}.$$

The rest of the proof derives tail bounds for the first two terms in (23). Applying the tail bounds to (23) completes the proof of Lemma 7.7.

We first consider the perturbation due to $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_1 = \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,1} + \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,2} + \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,3} + \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,4}$. Note that the following

identity holds deterministically.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{a}^\top \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,1} \boldsymbol{a} &= \boldsymbol{a}^\top \boldsymbol{V}_{\boldsymbol{u}_\parallel}^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}} \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{V}_{\boldsymbol{u}_\parallel} \boldsymbol{a} \\
&= \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{\substack{m'=1 \\ m' \neq m}}^{M} a_m^2 a_{m'}^2 \boldsymbol{u}_\parallel^\top \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'}\boldsymbol{u}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \boldsymbol{C}_{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'}\boldsymbol{u}} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \boldsymbol{u}_\parallel \\
&\quad - \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{\substack{m'=1 \\ m' \neq m}}^{M} a_m^2 a_{m'}^2 \boldsymbol{u}_\parallel^\top \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'}\boldsymbol{u}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \boldsymbol{C}_{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m}\boldsymbol{u}} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'} \boldsymbol{u}_\parallel \\
&= \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{\substack{m'=1 \\ m' \neq m}}^{M} a_m^2 a_{m'}^2 \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 \langle \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \boldsymbol{u}_\parallel \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'} \boldsymbol{u} \circledast \boldsymbol{x}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \boldsymbol{u}_\parallel \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'} \boldsymbol{u} \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \rangle \\
&\quad - \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{\substack{m'=1 \\ m' \neq m}}^{M} a_m^2 a_{m'}^2 \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 \langle \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \boldsymbol{u}_\parallel \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'} \boldsymbol{u} \circledast \boldsymbol{x}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \boldsymbol{u}_\parallel \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'} \boldsymbol{u} \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \rangle \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,1}$ is positive semidefinite, $\boldsymbol{a}^\top \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,1} \boldsymbol{a} = 0$ implies $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,1} \boldsymbol{a} = \boldsymbol{0}$. Therefore, it follows that

$$
\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,1} \boldsymbol{a} = \boldsymbol{0}.
$$

Since $\boldsymbol{a}^\top \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,1} \boldsymbol{a} = 0$, we also have

$$
\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,1} \boldsymbol{a} = 0.
$$

Therefore,

$$
(\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,1} - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,1}) \boldsymbol{a} = \boldsymbol{0},
$$

which implies

$$
\left(\boldsymbol{I}_M - \frac{\boldsymbol{a}\boldsymbol{a}^\top}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2} \right) (\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,1} - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,1}) \frac{\boldsymbol{a}}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2} = \boldsymbol{0}.
$$

This means that when we estimate $\boldsymbol{a}$ as the smallest eigenvector of $\boldsymbol{\Xi}$, the term $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,1} - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,1}$ does not add any perturbation to the estimate $\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}$. Therefore, we only need to compute tail bounds for the perturbation due to the other terms $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,2}$, $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,3}$, and $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,4}$, which are given in the following lemma.

Lemma 8.7. *Let $\epsilon \in (0,1)$. There exists an absolute constant C such that*

$$
\frac{\|\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{a})^\perp} (\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,2} - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,2}) \boldsymbol{a}\|_2}{\sin\widehat{\theta} \cos\widehat{\theta} \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2} \vee \frac{\|\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{a})^\perp} (\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,3} - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,3}) \boldsymbol{a}\|_2}{\sin\widehat{\theta} \cos\widehat{\theta} \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2} \vee \frac{\|\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{a})^\perp} (\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,4} - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{1,4}) \boldsymbol{a}\|_2}{\sin^2\widehat{\theta} \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2}
$$

is upper bounded by the maximum of

$$\frac{CK\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_4^2\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2}{(1-2\epsilon)\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+2(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^2,$$

$$\frac{CK\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+2(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\},$$

and

$$\frac{CK^{3/2}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|(\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_4^2\vee\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty)\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+2(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{1/2}$$

with probability $1-p$.

Lemma 8.7 is a corollary of Lemma D.1 and the proof of Lemma 8.7 is almost identical to that of Lemma 8.1. Therefore, we omit the proof.

Next, we consider the perturbation due to $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_2$ and $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_3$. By symmetry, it suffices to consider $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_2$ only. The following lemma provides corresponding tail bound.

Lemma 8.8. *Let* $\epsilon\in(0,1)$. *There exists an absolute constant* C *such that* $\|(\boldsymbol{\Xi}_2-\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Xi}_2)\boldsymbol{a}\|_2/\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2$ *is upper bounded by the maximum of*

$$\frac{C\sqrt{K}\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|(\sqrt{M}\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty^2\vee\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2\vee\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty)\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}{(1-2\epsilon)\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{3/2},$$

and

$$\frac{CK\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{1/2}$$

with probability $1-p$.

A sketch proof of Lemma 8.8. Note that $\boldsymbol{c}^\top\boldsymbol{\Xi}_2\boldsymbol{a}$ is written as

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{c}^\top\boldsymbol{\Xi}_2\boldsymbol{a}&=\boldsymbol{a}^\top\boldsymbol{V}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}^\top\boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}}\boldsymbol{\Phi}\boldsymbol{V}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\boldsymbol{a}\\&=\sum_{m=1}^M\sum_{\substack{m'=1\\m'\neq m}}^M a_m c_m a_{m'}\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m^\top\boldsymbol{C}_{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'}\boldsymbol{u}}^\top\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}\\&\quad-\sum_{m=1}^M\sum_{\substack{m'=1\\m'\neq m}}^M c_m a_{m'}^2\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m^\top\boldsymbol{C}_{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'}\boldsymbol{u}}^\top\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'}\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}.\end{aligned}$$

Then Lemma 8.8 is a direct corollary of Lemma F.1. The roadmap of the proof is almost identical to that of Lemma 8.1. Therefore, we omit further details. □

Lastly, for the perturbation with respect to $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_4$, the following lemma provides corresponding tail bounds.

Lemma 8.9. *Let $\epsilon \in (0,1)$. There exists an absolute constant C such that $\|(\boldsymbol{\Xi}_4 - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Xi}_4)\boldsymbol{a}\|_2/\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2$ is upper bounded by the maximum of*

$$\frac{C\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m} - \sigma_w^2 L\boldsymbol{I}_K\|M\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty}{(1-2\epsilon)\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right) + (D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\},$$

$$\frac{C\max_{m\neq m'\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\|(\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1 \vee \sqrt{M}\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty)}{(1-2\epsilon)\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right) + (D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\},$$

$$\frac{C\sqrt{K}\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m} - \sigma_w^2 L\boldsymbol{I}_K\|M\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty}{(1-2\epsilon)\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right) + (D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{1/2},$$

and

$$\frac{C\sqrt{K}\max_{m\neq m'\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\|}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right) + (D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{1/2}$$

with probability $1-p$.

Proof sketch of Lemma 8.8. Note that $\boldsymbol{c}^\top\boldsymbol{\Xi}_4\boldsymbol{a}$ is written as

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{c}^\top\boldsymbol{\Xi}_4\boldsymbol{a} &= \boldsymbol{c}^\top\boldsymbol{V}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}^\top\boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top(\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}}^\top\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}} - \sigma_w^2(M-1)L\boldsymbol{I}_{ML})\boldsymbol{\Phi}\boldsymbol{V}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\boldsymbol{a}\\ &= \sum_{m=1}^M\sum_{\substack{m'=1\\m'\neq m}}^M a_m c_m\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m^\top(\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}^\top\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}} - \sigma_w^2 L\boldsymbol{I}_L)\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}\\ &\quad - \sum_{m=1}^M\sum_{\substack{m'=1\\m'\neq m}}^M c_m a_{m'}\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m^\top\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}^\top\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'}\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}.\end{aligned}$$

Then Lemma 8.8 is a direct corollary of Lemma H.1. The roadmap of the proof is almost identical to that of Lemma 8.1. Therefore, we omit further details. □

8.3 Proof of Lemma 7.9

Recall that Algorithm 1 updates $\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}$ from a given $\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}$ as the least dominant eigenvector of the following matrix:

$$\boldsymbol{\Upsilon} = \boldsymbol{Y}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}}^\top\boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top(\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{y}}^\top\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{y}} - \hat{\sigma}_w^2(M-1)L\boldsymbol{I}_{MK})\boldsymbol{\Phi}\boldsymbol{Y}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}}$$

Let $\widehat{\vartheta}$ denote the principal angle between $\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}$ and $\boldsymbol{a}$ given by

$$\widehat{\vartheta} = \cos^{-1}\left(\frac{|\boldsymbol{a}^\top\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}|}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}\|_2}\right) \in [0, \pi/2).$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}\|_2 = 1$.

Note that $\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}$ is decomposed as

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}} = \boldsymbol{a}_\parallel + \boldsymbol{a}_\perp,$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{a}_{\|} = \frac{\boldsymbol{a}\boldsymbol{a}^\top}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2}\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}} \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{a}_{\perp} = \left(\boldsymbol{I}_M - \frac{\boldsymbol{a}\boldsymbol{a}^\top}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2}\right)\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}.$$

Then it follows that $\|\boldsymbol{a}_{\|}\|_2 = \cos\widehat{\vartheta}$ and $\|\boldsymbol{a}_{\perp}\|_2 = \sin\widehat{\vartheta}$. Furthermore, $\boldsymbol{Y}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}}$ is decomposed as $\boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}_{\|}} + \boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}_{\perp}}$.

As in the proof of Lemma 7.7, decompose $\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{y}}$ as the sum of the noiseless portion $\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}$ and the noise portion $\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}}$. Then $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}$ is decomposed as $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_1 + \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_2 + \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_3 + \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_4$, where $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_1, \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_2, \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_3, \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_4$ are given respectively by

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_1 &= \boldsymbol{Y}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}}^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}} \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{Y}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}}, \\
\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_2 &= \boldsymbol{Y}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}}^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}} \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{Y}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}}, \\
\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_3 &= \boldsymbol{Y}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}}^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}} \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{Y}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}}, \\
\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_4 &= \boldsymbol{Y}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}}^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top (\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}} + \sigma_w^2 (M-1) L \boldsymbol{I}_{ML}) \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{Y}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{a}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

We further decompose $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_1$ as $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,1} + \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,2} + \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,3} + \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,4}$ where $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,1}, \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,2}, \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,3}, \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,4}$ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,1} &= \boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}_{\|}}^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}} \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}_{\|}}, \\
\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,2} &= \boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}_{\|}}^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}} \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}_{\perp}}, \\
\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,3} &= \boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}_{\perp}}^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}} \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}_{\|}}, \\
\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,4} &= \boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}_{\perp}}^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}} \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}_{\perp}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Under (A1), the expectations are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,1} &= \cos^2\widehat{\vartheta} K^2 \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2 \boldsymbol{I}_M - \cos^2\widehat{\vartheta} K^2 \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \boldsymbol{a}\boldsymbol{a}^\top, \\
\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,2} &= \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,3} = \boldsymbol{0}_{D\times D}, \\
\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,4} &= \sin^2\widehat{\vartheta} K^2 \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2 \boldsymbol{I}_M - \sin^2\widehat{\vartheta} K^2 \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \mathrm{diag}(|\boldsymbol{a}|^2), \\
\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_2 &= \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_3 = \boldsymbol{0}_{D\times D}, \\
\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_4 &= K \mathrm{diag}\{(\sigma_w^2 L - \|\boldsymbol{w}_m\|_2^2)_{m=1}^M\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\boldsymbol{u}/\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2$ is the least dominant eigenvector of $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_1 + \sin^2\widehat{\vartheta} K^2 \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \mathrm{diag}(|\boldsymbol{a}|^2)$. Therefore, we consider $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}$ as a perturbed matrix from $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_1 + \sin^2\widehat{\vartheta} K^2 \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \mathrm{diag}(|\boldsymbol{a}|^2)$ with additive perturbation given by $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon} - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_1 - \sin^2\widehat{\vartheta} K^2 \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \mathrm{diag}(|\boldsymbol{a}|^2)$. Note that the gap between the first two largest eigenvalues of $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_1 + \sin^2\widehat{\vartheta} K^2 \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \mathrm{diag}(|\boldsymbol{a}|^2)$ is $\cos^2\widehat{\vartheta} K^2 \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2$.

Then by Davis-Kahan $\sin\theta$ theorem [23], the error in $\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}$ is upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}\sin\angle(\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}},\boldsymbol{u}) \leqslant & \frac{\sum_{k=1}^4 \|\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{u})^\perp}(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,k}-\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,k})\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{u})}\|}{\cos^2\widehat{\vartheta}K^2\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2} \\ & + \frac{\sum_{k=2}^4 \|\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{u})^\perp}(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{k}-\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{k})\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{u})}\|}{\cos^2\widehat{\vartheta}K^2\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2} \\ & + \frac{\sin^2\widehat{\vartheta}K^2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{u})^\perp}\mathrm{diag}(|\boldsymbol{a}|^2)\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{u})}\|}{\cos^2\widehat{\vartheta}K^2\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2} \\ & + \frac{K\|\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{u})^\perp}\mathrm{diag}\{(\sigma_w^2L-\|\boldsymbol{w}_m\|_2^2)_{m=1}^M\}\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{u})}\|}{\cos^2\widehat{\vartheta}K^2\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2}.\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

The last two terms in (24) are bounded by

$$\frac{\tan^2\widehat{\vartheta}\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty^2}{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2} + \frac{\max_m|\sigma_w^2L-\|\boldsymbol{w}_m\|_2^2|}{\cos^2\widehat{\vartheta}K\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2}.$$

The rest of the proof derives tail bounds for the first two terms in (24). Applying the tail bounds to (24) completes the proof of Lemma 7.9.

The tail bound for the first term in (24) is almost identical to the corresponding part of the proof of Lemma 7.7. We first note that the following identity holds deterministically.

$$\frac{\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2\boldsymbol{u}^\top\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,1}\boldsymbol{u}}{\|\boldsymbol{a}_\parallel\|_2^2} = \boldsymbol{u}^\top\boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}}^\top\boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}\boldsymbol{\Phi}\boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}}\boldsymbol{u} = 0.$$

From this, similarly to the proof of Lemma 7.7, we show that

$$\left(\boldsymbol{I}_D - \frac{\boldsymbol{u}\boldsymbol{u}^\top}{\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2}\right)(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,1}-\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,1})\frac{\boldsymbol{u}}{\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2} = \boldsymbol{0}.$$

This implies that $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,1}-\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,1}$ does not add any perturbation to the estimate $\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}$.

Tail bounds for the perturbation due to $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,2}$, $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,3}$, and $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,4}$ are given in the following lemmas.

Lemma 8.10. *Let $\epsilon\in(0,1)$. There exists an absolute constant C such that*

$$\frac{\|\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{u})^\perp}(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,2}-\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,2})\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}{\sin\widehat{\vartheta}\cos\widehat{\vartheta}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2} \vee \frac{\|\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{u})^\perp}(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,3}-\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,3})\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}{\sin\widehat{\vartheta}\cos\widehat{\vartheta}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}$$

is upper bounded by the maximum of

$$\frac{CK\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_4^2\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2}{(1-2\epsilon)\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+2(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^2,$$

$$\frac{CK\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+2(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\},$$

and

$$\frac{CK^{3/2}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|(\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_4^2 \vee \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty)\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+2(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{1/2}$$

with probability $1-p$.

Lemma 8.11. *Let* $\epsilon \in (0,1)$. *There exists an absolute constant* C *such that*

$$\frac{\|\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,4}-\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,4}\|}{\sin^2\widehat{\vartheta}}$$

is upper bounded by the maximum of

$$\frac{CK\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_4^2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+2(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{2},$$

$$\frac{CK\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+2(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\},$$

and

$$\frac{CK^{3/2}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+2(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{1/2}$$

with probability $1-p$.

In fact, the tail bound in Lemma 8.11 is larger than that of Lemma 8.10 by factor up to $\sqrt{M}$. However, in Lemma 7.9, it was assumed that $\sin^2\widehat{\vartheta} \lesssim M^{-1/2}$. Therefore, we can use the upper bound in Lemma 8.10 for the perturbation due to $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,4}$ too.

Once one express $\boldsymbol{v}^{\top}\boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\top}\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}\boldsymbol{\Phi}\boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\boldsymbol{u}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\boldsymbol{v}^{\top}\boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\top}\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}\boldsymbol{\Phi}\boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\boldsymbol{u}\\
&=\sum_{m=1}^{M}\sum_{\substack{m'=1\\m'\neq m}}^{M} c_m d_m a_{m'}^2 \boldsymbol{v}^{\top}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m^{\top}\boldsymbol{C}_{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'}\boldsymbol{u}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\boldsymbol{C}_{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'}\boldsymbol{u}}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m\boldsymbol{u}\\
&-\sum_{m=1}^{M}\sum_{\substack{m'=1\\m'\neq m}}^{M} a_m c_m a_{m'} d_{m'} \boldsymbol{v}^{\top}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m^{\top}\boldsymbol{C}_{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'}\boldsymbol{u}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\boldsymbol{C}_{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m}\boldsymbol{u}}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'}\boldsymbol{u},
\end{aligned}$$

then Lemmas lemmas 8.10 and 8.11 are obtained as direct corollaries of Lemma D.1. Therefore, we omit the proofs.

Next, we consider the perturbation due to $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_2$ and $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_3$. By symmetry, it suffices to consider $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_2$ only. We further decompose $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_2$ as $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{2,1}+\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,2}+\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,3}+\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{1,4}$ where $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{2,1}, \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{2,2}, \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{2,3}, \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{2,4}$ are

defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{2,1} &= \boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}_\parallel}^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}} \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}_\parallel}, \\
\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{2,2} &= \boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}_\parallel}^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}} \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}_\perp}, \\
\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{2,3} &= \boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}_\perp}^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}} \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}_\parallel}, \\
\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{2,4} &= \boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}_\perp}^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}} \boldsymbol{\Phi} \boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}_\perp}.
\end{aligned}$$

The following lemmas provide corresponding tail bound.

Lemma 8.12. *Let $\epsilon \in (0,1)$. There exists an absolute constant C such that*

$$\frac{\|\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{u})^\perp}(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{2,1} - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{2,1})\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}{\cos^2\widehat{\vartheta}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}$$

is upper bounded by the maximum of

$$\frac{C\sqrt{K}\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|(\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2 \vee \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty)\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}{(1-2\epsilon)\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right) + (D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{3/2},$$

and

$$\frac{CK\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right) + (D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{1/2}$$

with probability $1-p$.

Lemma 8.13. *Let $\epsilon \in (0,1)$. There exists an absolute constant C such that*

$$\frac{\|\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{u})^\perp}(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{2,2} - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{2,2})\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}{\sin\widehat{\vartheta}\cos\widehat{\vartheta}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2} \vee \frac{\|\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{u})^\perp}(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{2,3} - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{2,3})\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}{\sin\widehat{\vartheta}\cos\widehat{\vartheta}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}$$

is upper bounded by the maximum of

$$\frac{C\sqrt{K}\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}{(1-2\epsilon)\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right) + (D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{3/2},$$

and

$$\frac{CK\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right) + (D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{1/2}$$

with probability $1-p$.

Lemma 8.14. *Let $\epsilon \in (0,1)$. There exists an absolute constant C such that*

$$\frac{\|\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{u})^\perp}(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{2,4} - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{2,4})\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}{\sin^2\widehat{\vartheta}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}$$

is upper bounded by the maximum of

$$\frac{C\sqrt{K}\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|(\sqrt{M}\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_{\infty}\vee\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1)\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{3/2},$$

and

$$\frac{CK\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{1/2}$$

with probability $1-p$.

Again, Lemmas lemmas 8.12 to 8.14 are obtained as direct corollaries of Lemma F.1 once one recognize $\boldsymbol{v}^{\top}\boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\top}\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}}\boldsymbol{\Phi}\boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\boldsymbol{u}$ is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\boldsymbol{v}^{\top}\boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{c}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\top}\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{h},\boldsymbol{x}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}}\boldsymbol{\Phi}\boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\boldsymbol{u}\\
&=\sum_{m=1}^{M}\sum_{\substack{m'=1\\m'\neq m}}^{M}c_m d_m a_{m'}\boldsymbol{v}^{\top}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m^{\top}\boldsymbol{C}_{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'}\boldsymbol{u}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m\boldsymbol{u}\\
&-\sum_{m=1}^{M}\sum_{\substack{m'=1\\m'\neq m}}^{M}c_m a_{m'} d_{m'}\boldsymbol{v}^{\top}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m^{\top}\boldsymbol{C}_{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'}\boldsymbol{u}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'}\boldsymbol{u}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we omit the proofs.

Lastly, for the perturbation with respect to $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_4$, we further decompose $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_4$ as $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{4,1}+\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{4,2}+\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{4,3}+\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{4,4}$ where $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{4,1},\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{4,2},\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{4,3},\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{4,4}$ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{4,1}&=\boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}_{\|}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\top}\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}}\boldsymbol{\Phi}\boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}_{\|}},\\
\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{4,2}&=\boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}_{\|}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\top}\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}}\boldsymbol{\Phi}\boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}_{\perp}},\\
\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{4,3}&=\boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}_{\perp}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\top}\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}}\boldsymbol{\Phi}\boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}_{\|}},\\
\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{4,4}&=\boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}_{\perp}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\top}\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}}^{\top}\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}}\boldsymbol{\Phi}\boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{a}_{\perp}}.
\end{aligned}$$

We first present intermediate tail bounds given by the following lemmas.

Lemma 8.15. *Let* $\epsilon\in(0,1)$. *There exists an absolute constant* C *such that*

$$\frac{\|\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{u})^{\perp}}(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{4,1}-\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{4,1})\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}{\cos^2\widehat{\vartheta}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}$$

is upper bounded by the maximum of

$$\frac{C\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^{\top}\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}-\sigma_w^2L\boldsymbol{I}_K\|M\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_{\infty}^2}{(1-2\epsilon)\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\},$$

$$\frac{C\max_{m\neq m'\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\|\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty}{(1-2\epsilon)\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\},$$

$$\frac{C\sqrt{K}\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}-\sigma_w^2L\boldsymbol{I}_K\|M\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_4^2}{(1-2\epsilon)\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{1/2},$$

and

$$\frac{C\sqrt{K}\max_{m\neq m'\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\|}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{1/2}$$

with probability $1-p$.

Lemma 8.16. *Let* $\epsilon\in(0,1)$. *There exists an absolute constant* C *such that*

$$\frac{\|\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{u})^\perp}(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{4,2}-\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{4,2})\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}{\sin\widehat{\vartheta}\cos\widehat{\vartheta}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}\vee\frac{\|\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{u})^\perp}(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{4,3}-\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{4,3})\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}{\sin\widehat{\vartheta}\cos\widehat{\vartheta}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}$$

is upper bounded by the maximum of

$$\frac{C\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}-\sigma_w^2L\boldsymbol{I}_K\|M\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty}{(1-2\epsilon)\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\},$$

$$\frac{C\max_{m\neq m'\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\|(\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1\vee\sqrt{M}\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty)}{(1-2\epsilon)\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\},$$

$$\frac{C\sqrt{K}\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}-\sigma_w^2L\boldsymbol{I}_K\|M\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty}{(1-2\epsilon)\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{1/2},$$

and

$$\frac{C\sqrt{K}\max_{m\neq m'\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\|}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{1/2}$$

with probability $1-p$.

Lemma 8.17. *Let* $\epsilon\in(0,1)$. *There exists an absolute constant* C *such that*

$$\frac{\|\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{u})^\perp}(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{4,4}-\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_{4,4})\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}{\sin^2\widehat{\vartheta}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}$$

is upper bounded by the maximum of

$$\frac{C\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}-\sigma_w^2L\boldsymbol{I}_K\|M}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\},$$

$$\frac{C\max_{m\neq m'\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\|\sqrt{M}}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\},$$

$$\frac{C\sqrt{K}\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}-\sigma_w^2L\boldsymbol{I}_K\|M}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{1/2},$$

and

$$\frac{C\sqrt{K}\max_{m\neq m'\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\|}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{1/2}$$

with probability $1-p$.

Similarly to the case of $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_2$, we omit the proofs because Lemmas lemmas 8.15 to 8.17 are obtained as direct corollaries of Lemma H.1 given

$$\begin{aligned}
&\boldsymbol{v}^\top\boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{c}}^\top\boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top(\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}}^\top\boldsymbol{M}_{\boldsymbol{w}}-\sigma_w^2(M-1)L\boldsymbol{I}_{ML})\boldsymbol{\Phi}\boldsymbol{Y}_{\boldsymbol{d}}\boldsymbol{u}\\
&=\sum_{m=1}^{M}\sum_{\substack{m'=1\\m'\neq m}}^{M}c_md_m\boldsymbol{v}^\top\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m^\top(\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}^\top\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}-\sigma_w^2L\boldsymbol{I}_L)\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m\boldsymbol{u}\\
&-\sum_{m=1}^{M}\sum_{\substack{m'=1\\m'\neq m}}^{M}c_md_{m'}\boldsymbol{v}^\top\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m^\top\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}^\top\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'}\boldsymbol{u}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, combining Lemmas lemmas 8.15 to 8.17, we obtain the following lemma, which provides a tail bound on the perturbation term due to $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_4$.

Lemma 8.18. *Let* $\epsilon\in(0,1)$. *Suppose that* $\sin\widehat{\vartheta}\lesssim M^{-1/2}$. *There exists an absolute constant* C *such that*

$$\frac{\|\boldsymbol{P}_{R(\boldsymbol{u})^\perp}(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_4-\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_4)\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}{\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2}$$

is upper bounded by the maximum of

$$\frac{C\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}-\sigma_w^2L\boldsymbol{I}_K\|M\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty^2}{(1-2\epsilon)\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\},$$

$$\frac{C\max_{m\neq m'\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\|\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_1\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty}{(1-2\epsilon)\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\},$$

$$\frac{C\sqrt{K}\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}-\sigma_w^2L\boldsymbol{I}_K\|M\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_4^2}{(1-2\epsilon)\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2^2}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{1/2},$$

and

$$\frac{C\sqrt{K}\max_{m\neq m'\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\|}{1-2\epsilon}\left\{\log\left(\frac{2}{p}\right)+(D+M)\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)\right\}^{1/2}$$

with probability $1-p$.

9 Conclusion

We studied algorithms and performance guarantees for multichannel blind deconvolution. In particular, we consider a system model that admits a parsimonious bilinear model. This model was

inspired from a channel estimation problem in underwater acoustics, where a bilinear channel model is obtained by linearization through manifold embedding. Under this bilinear model, we modified classical cross convolution method based on the commutativity of the convolution operator. With the help of the bilinear model, stable recovery is possible with short input signal. This enables fast estimation of the channel parameters which has potential utility in estimating time-varying channels. On the other hand, the recovery is no longer cast as a simple eigenvalue decomposition. We propose an alternating minimization algorithm with a simple and guaranteed initialization. When the basis in the bilinear model is random, we have shown that the proposed algorithm converges linearly to stable estimates of the unknown channel parameters together with provable non-asymptotic performance guarantee.

Our analysis involves suprema of coupled fourth order subgaussian processes. More specifically, we have used the concentration of a subgaussian polynomial random vector together with the union bound through the ϵ-net argument. This strategy was shown suboptimal in terms of scaling of the parameters for related analysis in compressed sensing. We are investigating new tools that will enable an improved error bound with a better scaling law of the parameters.

Acknowledgement

The authors thank Sohail Bahmani, Yonina Eldar, Felix Krahmer, and Thomas Strohmer for helpful comments.

A Proof of Lemma 4.1

Recall that $\boldsymbol{Z} = \mathcal{A}^*\boldsymbol{y} \times_3 \mathbb{1}$ and $\boldsymbol{y} = \mathcal{A}(\boldsymbol{u} \otimes \boldsymbol{x} \otimes \boldsymbol{a}) + \boldsymbol{w}$. Let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}} \in \mathbb{R}^D$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^L$. Let $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m = \boldsymbol{S}^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}_m$ for $m \in [M]$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top \boldsymbol{Z} \widehat{\boldsymbol{x}} &= \mathcal{A}^*\boldsymbol{y} \times_1 \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}} \times_2 \widehat{\boldsymbol{x}} \times_3 \mathbb{1} = \langle \mathcal{A}^*\boldsymbol{y}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \widehat{\boldsymbol{x}} \otimes \mathbb{1} \rangle \\ &= \langle \boldsymbol{y}, \mathcal{A}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \widehat{\boldsymbol{x}} \otimes \mathbb{1}) \rangle = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \langle \boldsymbol{y}_m, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}} \circledast \widehat{\boldsymbol{x}} \rangle = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \boldsymbol{y}_m^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}} \widehat{\boldsymbol{x}}.\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\boldsymbol{C}_{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}^\top \boldsymbol{y}_m = \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}} \circledast \boldsymbol{y}_m = \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{y}_m} \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}},$$

we have

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top \boldsymbol{Z} \widehat{\boldsymbol{x}} = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m^\top \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{y}_m}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{x}}.$$

The vectors $\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ were arbitrary. Therefore,

$$\boldsymbol{Z} = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m^\top \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{y}_m}^\top,$$

which implies

$$\boldsymbol{Z}\boldsymbol{Z}^\top = \sum_{m,m'=1}^{M} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m^\top \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{y}_m}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{y}_{m'}} \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'}.$$

By the commutativity of the product of two circulant matrices, $\boldsymbol{Z}\boldsymbol{Z}^\top$ is written as

$$\boldsymbol{Z}\boldsymbol{Z}^\top = \sum_{m,m'=1}^{M} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{y}_m}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{y}_{m'}} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m.$$

Applying $\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{y}_{m'}} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m = \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{y}_{m'}} \boldsymbol{S}^\top \boldsymbol{\Phi}_m = \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{y}_{m'}} \boldsymbol{\Phi}_m$ to the above result completes the proof.

B Expectations

Lemma B.1. *Let $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_m = [\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,K}]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times D}$ be a random matrix such that $\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k}$'s are independent and $\mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k} = \boldsymbol{0}_{D\times 1}$ and $\mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k}\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k}^\top = \boldsymbol{I}_D$ for all $k \in [K]$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \boldsymbol{u} \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \boldsymbol{v} = K(\boldsymbol{u}^\top \boldsymbol{v}) \boldsymbol{e}_1.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \boldsymbol{u} \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \boldsymbol{v} &= \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{K} (\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k}^\top \boldsymbol{u}) \boldsymbol{e}_k \right) \circledast \left(\sum_{k'=1}^{K} (\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k'}^\top \boldsymbol{v}) \boldsymbol{e}_{k'} \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{K} (\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k}^\top \boldsymbol{u}) \boldsymbol{e}_{-k+2} \right) \circledast \left(\sum_{k'=1}^{K} (\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k'}^\top \boldsymbol{v}) \boldsymbol{e}_{k'} \right) \\
&= \sum_{k,k'=1}^{K} \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} (\boldsymbol{u}^\top \boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k'}^\top \boldsymbol{v}) \boldsymbol{e}_{k'-k+2-1} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} (\boldsymbol{u}^\top \boldsymbol{v}) \boldsymbol{e}_1.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma B.2. *Let $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_m = [\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,K}]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times D}$ be a random matrix such that $\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k}$'s are independent and $\mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k} = \boldsymbol{0}_{D\times 1}$ and $\mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k}\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k}^\top = \boldsymbol{I}_D$ for all $k \in [K]$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \boldsymbol{u} \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{u}^\top \boldsymbol{v} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \boldsymbol{e}_{2k-1}.$$

Proof.

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m\boldsymbol{u}\circledast\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m\boldsymbol{v}=\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{K}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k}^\top\boldsymbol{u})\boldsymbol{e}_k\right)\circledast\left(\sum_{k'=1}^{K}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k'}^\top\boldsymbol{v})\boldsymbol{e}_{k'}\right)$$
$$=\sum_{k,k'=1}^{K}\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(\boldsymbol{u}^\top\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k}\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k'}^\top\boldsymbol{v})\boldsymbol{e}_{k'+k-1}=\sum_{k=1}^{K}(\boldsymbol{u}^\top\boldsymbol{v})\boldsymbol{e}_{2k-1}.$$

□

C Matrix and Tensor Norms: Diagonal & 4th Order

Lemma C.1. *Let $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_m\in\mathbb{R}^{K\times D}$ for $m\in[M]$. Let $\boldsymbol{\phi}=[\mathrm{vec}(\Phi_1)^\top,\ldots,\mathrm{vec}(\Phi_{\mathrm{M}})^\top]^\top\in\mathbb{R}^{\mathrm{MKD}}$. Suppose that $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ is a random vector following $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_{MKD\times1},\boldsymbol{I}_{MKD})$. Let $\boldsymbol{a}=[a_1,\ldots,a_M]^\top\in\mathbb{R}^M$ and $\breve{\boldsymbol{u}},\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\in\mathbb{S}^{D-1}$. Let*

$$h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})=\sum_{m=1}^{M}\sum_{\substack{m'=1\\m'\neq m}}^{M}a_m^2h_m^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}),$$

where

$$h_m^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})=\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}\circledast\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}\circledast\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2.$$

Then,

$$\mathbb{P}(|h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})-\mathbb{E}h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})|\geqslant t)$$
$$\leqslant 2\exp\left(-C\min\left\{\left(\frac{t}{32\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_4^2K^{3/2}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|}\right)^2,\right.\right.$$
$$\left.\left.\frac{t}{32\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty^2K\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|},\left(\frac{t}{32\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty^2K\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|}\right)^{1/2}\right\}\right).$$

Proof of Lemma C.1. We obtain the tail bound in Lemma C.1 by using [31, Theorem 1.4]. To this end, we compute various norms of the expectation of derivatives of $h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$.

Let $\boldsymbol{\phi}_m$ denote $\mathrm{vec}(\Phi_{\mathrm{m}})$ for $m\in[M]$. The k_1th block of $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}h_m^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is given by

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_1}}h_m^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})=2\langle\boldsymbol{e}_{k_1},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\circledast\mathfrak{J}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\circledast\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\circledast\mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{x}\circledast\boldsymbol{x}\rangle\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}$$
$$+2\langle\boldsymbol{e}_{k_1},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\circledast\mathfrak{J}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\circledast\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\circledast\mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{x}\circledast\boldsymbol{x}\rangle\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}.$$

Then, $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} h_m^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} h_m^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = 2\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]} \left(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \circledast \mathfrak{J} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \circledast \mathfrak{J} \boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \right) \tilde{\otimes} \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \\ + 2\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]} \left(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \circledast \mathfrak{J} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \circledast \mathfrak{J} \boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \right) \tilde{\otimes} \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, since

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} h_m^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \mathbf{0}, \quad \forall m \in [M],$$

it follows that the first derivative of $h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} h(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \mathbf{0}.$$

Next, we compute the spectral and Frobenius norms of the expectation of the second derivative. Since

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} h_m^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \mathbf{0}, \quad \forall m' \neq m,$$

it follows that the second derivative of $h_m^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^2 h_m^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = (\boldsymbol{e}_m \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_m) \tilde{\otimes} \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}^2 h_m^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}). \tag{25}$$

The (k_1, k_2)th block of $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}^2 h_m^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_2}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_1}} h_m^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = 2\langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_2}, \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1} \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \circledast \mathfrak{J} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \circledast \mathfrak{J} \boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \rangle \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top \\ + 2\langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_2}, \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1} \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \circledast \mathfrak{J} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \circledast \mathfrak{J} \boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \rangle \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}^\top \\ + 2\langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_2}, \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1} \circledast \mathfrak{J} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \circledast \mathfrak{J} \boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \rangle \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}^\top \\ + 2\langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_2}, \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1} \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \circledast \mathfrak{J} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \circledast \mathfrak{J} \boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \rangle \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top \\ + 2\langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_2}, \mathfrak{J} \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1} \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \circledast \mathfrak{J} \boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \rangle (\breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}^\top + \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top).\end{aligned}$$

By Lemmas B.1 and B.2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_2}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_1}} h_m^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = 2K \|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2^2 \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_2}, \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1} \circledast \mathfrak{J} \boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \rangle \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top \\ + 2K \|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2^2 \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_2}, \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1} \circledast \mathfrak{J} \boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \rangle \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}^\top \\ + 2K \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_2}, \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1} \circledast \mathfrak{J} \boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \rangle \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}^\top \\ + 2K \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_2}, \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1} \circledast \mathfrak{J} \boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \rangle \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top \\ + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{K} \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_2}, \mathfrak{J} \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1} \circledast \boldsymbol{e}_{2k-1} \circledast \mathfrak{J} \boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \rangle (\breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}^\top + \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top).\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}h^{(1)}_m(\boldsymbol{\phi}) &= 2K\|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2^2\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top\tilde{\otimes}\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top + 2K\|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2^2\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top\tilde{\otimes}\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}^\top\\ &+ 2K\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top\tilde{\otimes}\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}^\top + 2K\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top\tilde{\otimes}\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top\\ &+ 2\sum_{k=1}^K\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}\boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}}^\top\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{e}_{2k-1}}\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top\tilde{\otimes}(\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}^\top+\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}h^{(1)}_m(\boldsymbol{\phi})\| &\leqslant 12K\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|\|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2\|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2\\ \|\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}h^{(1)}_m(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\mathrm{F}} &\leqslant 12K^{3/2}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|\|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2\|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2.\end{aligned}$$

By (25), the expectation of the 2nd derivative of $h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is given by

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \sum_{m=1}^M a_m^2(\boldsymbol{e}_m\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_m)\tilde{\otimes}\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}h^{(1)}_m(\boldsymbol{\phi}).$$

Since $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is block diagonal, its spectral and Frobenius norms are respectively bounded by

$$\|\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\| \leqslant 12\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty^2K\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|\|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2^2\|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2^2,$$

and

$$\|\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\mathrm{F}} \leqslant 12\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_4^2K^{3/2}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|\|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2^2\|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2^2.$$

Then we compute the third derivative. The third derivative of $h^{(1)}_m(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}&\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_3}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_2}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_1}}h^{(1)}_m(\boldsymbol{\phi})\\ &= 2\langle\boldsymbol{e}_{k_3},\boldsymbol{e}_{k_2}\circledast\boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}}\boldsymbol{e}_{k_1}\circledast\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\circledast\boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}}\boldsymbol{x}\circledast\boldsymbol{x}\rangle(\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\otimes\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\otimes\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}+\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\otimes\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\otimes\breve{\boldsymbol{u}})\\ &+ 2\langle\boldsymbol{e}_{k_3},\boldsymbol{e}_{k_2}\circledast\boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}}\boldsymbol{e}_{k_1}\circledast\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\circledast\boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}}\boldsymbol{x}\circledast\boldsymbol{x}\rangle(\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\otimes\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\otimes\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}+\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\otimes\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\otimes\breve{\boldsymbol{u}})\\ &+ 2\langle\boldsymbol{e}_{k_3},\boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}}\boldsymbol{e}_{k_2}\circledast\boldsymbol{e}_{k_1}\circledast\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\circledast\boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}}\boldsymbol{x}\circledast\boldsymbol{x}\rangle(\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\otimes\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\otimes\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}+\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\otimes\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\otimes\breve{\boldsymbol{u}})\\ &+ 2\langle\boldsymbol{e}_{k_3},\boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}}\boldsymbol{e}_{k_2}\circledast\boldsymbol{e}_{k_1}\circledast\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\circledast\boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}}\boldsymbol{x}\circledast\boldsymbol{x}\rangle(\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\otimes\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\otimes\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}+\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\otimes\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\otimes\breve{\boldsymbol{u}})\\ &+ 2\langle\boldsymbol{e}_{k_3},\boldsymbol{e}_{k_2}\circledast\boldsymbol{e}_{k_1}\circledast\boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\circledast\boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}}\boldsymbol{x}\circledast\boldsymbol{x}\rangle(\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\otimes\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\otimes\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}+\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\otimes\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\otimes\breve{\boldsymbol{v}})\\ &+ 2\langle\boldsymbol{e}_{k_3},\boldsymbol{e}_{k_2}\circledast\boldsymbol{e}_{k_1}\circledast\boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\circledast\boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}}\boldsymbol{x}\circledast\boldsymbol{x}\rangle(\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\otimes\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\otimes\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}+\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\otimes\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\otimes\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}).\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_3}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_2}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_1}}h^{(1)}_m(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \boldsymbol{0},\quad\forall k_1,k_2,k_3\in[K],$$

it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla^3_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}h^{(1)}_m(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \boldsymbol{0},\quad\forall m\in[M].$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \nabla^3_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} h(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \mathbf{0}.$$

Lastly, we compute the fourth derivative. Since $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}} h^{(1)}_m(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \mathbf{0}$ for all $m' \neq m$, it follows that $\nabla^4_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} h^{(1)}_m(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is a block-diagonal tensor, i.e.,

$$\nabla^4_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} h^{(1)}_m(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = (\boldsymbol{e}_m \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_m \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_m \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_m) \tilde{\otimes} \nabla^4_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} h^{(1)}_m(\boldsymbol{\phi}). \tag{26}$$

The (k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4)th block of $\nabla^4_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} h(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_4}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_3}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_2}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_1}} h^{(1)}_m(\boldsymbol{\phi}) \\
&= 2\langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_4}, \boldsymbol{e}_{k_3} \circledast \boldsymbol{e}_{k_2} \circledast \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}} \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1} \circledast \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}} \boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \rangle \\
&\qquad \cdot (\breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} + \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} + \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} + \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}) \\
&+ 2\langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_4}, \boldsymbol{e}_{k_3} \circledast \boldsymbol{e}_{k_2} \circledast \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}} \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1} \circledast \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}} \boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \rangle \\
&\qquad \cdot (\breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} + \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} + \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} + \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}) \\
&+ 2\langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_4}, \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}} \boldsymbol{e}_{k_3} \circledast \boldsymbol{e}_{k_2} \circledast \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1} \circledast \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}} \boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \rangle \\
&\qquad \cdot (\breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} + \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} + \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} + \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}).
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

By (26), the 4th derivative of $h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is given by

$$\nabla^4_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \sum_{m=1}^{M} a_m^2 (\boldsymbol{e}_m \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_m \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_m \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_m) \tilde{\otimes} \nabla^4_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} h^{(1)}_m(\boldsymbol{\phi}).$$

The tensor norms of the block $\nabla^4_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} h^{(1)}_m(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is bounded by the following lemma.

Lemma C.2.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{\substack{\mathcal{J} \in P_4 \\ |\mathcal{J}| \geqslant 2}} \|\nabla^4_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} h^{(1)}_m(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\mathcal{J}} \leqslant 32K \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\| \|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2^2 \|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2^2 \\
&\|\nabla^4_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} h^{(1)}_m(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\{1,2,3,4\}} \leqslant 32 \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\| K^{3/2} \|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2^2 \|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we compute $\|\nabla^4_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\{1,2,3,4\}}$. Since $\nabla^4_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is block diagonal, by Lemma C.2, it follows that

$$\|\nabla^4_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\{1,2,3,4\}} \leqslant 32 \|\boldsymbol{a}\|_4^2 K^{3/2} \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\| \|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2^2 \|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2^2.$$

Next, note that any rearrangement of $\nabla^4_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ with respect to a partition $\mathcal{J} \in P_4$ with $|\mathcal{J}| \geqslant 2$ ends up with a block diagonal matrix/tensor (up to permutations) due to the block

diagonal structure in $\nabla^4_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$. Therefore, by Lemma C.2,

$$\max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\in P_4\\ |\mathcal{J}|\geqslant 2}} \|\nabla^4_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} h^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\mathcal{J}} \leqslant 32\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty^2 K \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\| \|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2^2 \|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2^2.$$

Appying the above norm bounds to [31, Theorem 1.4] completes the proof. □

Now, we present the proof of Lemma C.2, which uses the following lemma. The proof of Lemma C.3 is deferred to the end of this section.

Lemma C.3. *Let $a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 \in \{\pm 1\}$ and $b \in [L]$. Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}} \in \mathbb{R}^{K\times K\times K\times K}$ be given*

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}(k_1,k_2,k_3,k_4) = \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{a_4k_4 \oplus a_3k_3 \oplus a_2k_2 \oplus a_1k_1 \oplus b}, \mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x}\rangle,$$

for all $k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4 \in [K]$. Then

$$\max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\in P_4\\ |\mathcal{J}|\geqslant 2}} \|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}\|_{\mathcal{J}} \leqslant K\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|,$$
$$\|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}\|_{\{1,2,3,4\}} \leqslant K^{3/2}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|.$$

Proof of Lemma C.2. We consider the very first summand in (27), which corresponds to the tensor $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{R}^{KD\times KD\times KD\times KD}$ whose (k_1,k_2,k_3,k_4)th block of size $D\times D\times D\times D$ is given by

$$\langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_4 \ominus k_3 \oplus k_2 \ominus k_1 \oplus 1}, \mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x}\rangle (\breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}).$$

Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}} \in \mathbb{R}^{K\times K\times K\times K}$ be given by

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}(k_1,k_2,k_3,k_4) = \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_4 \ominus k_3 \oplus k_2 \ominus m, k_1 \oplus 1}, \mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x}\rangle.$$

Then,

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}} = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}} \,\tilde{\otimes}\, (\breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}).$$

For any $\mathcal{J} \in P_4$, we have

$$\|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{\mathcal{J}} = \|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2^2 \|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2^2.$$

Therefore,

$$\|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}}\|_{\mathcal{J}} = \|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}\|_{\mathcal{J}} \|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{\mathcal{J}} \leqslant \|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}\|_{\mathcal{J}} \|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2^2 \|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2^2.$$

By Lemma C.3, we have

$$\max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\in P_4\\ |\mathcal{J}|\geqslant 2}} \|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}}\|_{\mathcal{J}} \leqslant K\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|\|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2^2\|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2^2,$$
$$\|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}}\|_{\{1,2,3,4\}} \leqslant K^{3/2}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|\|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2^2\|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2^2.$$

The tensors corresponding to the other summands in (27) are obtained by applying tensor permutations to $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}}$, which preserves the tensor norms. Therefore, applying the triangle inequality provides the tensor norm bounds. □

Finally, we prove Lemma C.3.

Proof of Lemma C.3. We consider the case where $a_1 = a_3 = -1$, $a_2 = a_4 = 1$, and $b = 1$. Then $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}} \in \mathbb{R}^{K\times K\times K\times K}$ is given by

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}(k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4) = \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_4\ominus k_3\oplus k_2\ominus k_1\oplus 1}, \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}}\boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x}\rangle.$$

Let $\boldsymbol{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{K^2\times K^2}$ be obtained by rearranging the tensor $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}$ as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{C}(K(k_1-1)+k_2, K(k_3-1)+k_4) = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}(k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4).$$

Let $\boldsymbol{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{L^2\times L^2}$ be given by

$$\boldsymbol{H}(L(t_1-1)+t_2, L(t_3-1)+t_4) = \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{t_4\ominus t_3\oplus t_2\ominus t_1\oplus 1}, \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}}\boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x}\rangle,$$

for $t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4 \in [L]$. Note that $\boldsymbol{H}$ is a block circulant matrix with circulant blocks where its first column is $\mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}})$. Then $\boldsymbol{H}$ and $\boldsymbol{C}$ are related by

$$\boldsymbol{C} = ((\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]} \tilde{\otimes} \boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}) \otimes (\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]} \tilde{\otimes} \boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}))\boldsymbol{H}.$$

We partition $\boldsymbol{C}$ into $K \times K$ blocks of size $K \times K$. Then each block is obtained by applying $\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}$ and $\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top$ respectively from the left and right to the corresponding block of $\boldsymbol{H}$. Since each block of $\boldsymbol{H}$ is equivalent to $\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}$ up to row/column permutations, it follows that each block of $\boldsymbol{C}$ has spectral norm upper bounded by $\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|$. Therefore, by simple algebra (direct computation or block Gershgorin), it follows that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}\|_{\{1,2\}\{3,4\}} = \|\boldsymbol{C}\| \leqslant K\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|.$$

On the other hand, $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{C}}$ is a rearrangement of $\boldsymbol{C}$. Recall that each block of $\boldsymbol{C}$ has spectral norm up to $\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|$. Since $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{C}}$ is partitioned into $K^2 \times 1$ array whose entries are K-by-K matrices of spectral

norm no larger than 1, by simple algebra, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}\|_{\{1,2,3\}\{4\}} = \|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{C}}\| \leqslant K\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|.$$

For other partitions $\mathcal{J} \in P_4$ of size 2, the resulting matrix of size K^2-by-K^2 or K^3-by-K has the same structure as in $\boldsymbol{C}$ or $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{C}}$ by tensor permutations. Therefore, we have

$$\max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\in P_4 \\ |\mathcal{J}|=2}} \|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}\|_{\mathcal{J}} \leqslant K\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|.$$

By the variational characterization of the tensor norms, finer partition results in a smaller tensor norm, i.e., it follows that

$$\max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\in P_4 \\ |\mathcal{J}|\geqslant 2}} \|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}\|_{\mathcal{J}} \leqslant \max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\in P_4 \\ |\mathcal{J}|=2}} \|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}\|_{\mathcal{J}} \leqslant K\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|.$$

Finally, the Frobenius norm of each block of $\boldsymbol{C}$ is upper bounded by $\sqrt{K}$ times the spectral norm and there are K^2 blocks. Therefore,

$$\|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}\|_{\{1,2,3,4\}} = \|\boldsymbol{C}\|_{\mathrm{F}} \leqslant K^{3/2}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|.$$

□

D Matrix and Tensor Norms: Off-Diagonal & 4th Order

Lemma D.1. *Let $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_m \in \mathbb{R}^{K\times D}$ for $m \in [M]$. Let $\boldsymbol{\phi} = [\mathrm{vec}(\Phi_1)^\top, \ldots, \mathrm{vec}(\Phi_{\mathrm{M}})^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathrm{MKD}}$. Suppose that $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ is a random vector following $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{0}_{MKD\times 1}, \boldsymbol{I}_{MKD})$. Let $\boldsymbol{b} = [b_1, \ldots, b_M]^\top, \boldsymbol{b}' = [b'_1, \ldots, b'_M]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^M$ and $\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}, \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}', \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}, \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' \in \mathbb{S}^{D-1}$. Let*

$$\chi^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{\substack{m'=1 \\ m'\neq m}}^{M} b_m b'_{m'} \chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}),$$

where

$$\chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \langle \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'} \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' \circledast \boldsymbol{x}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'} \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}' \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \rangle.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}(|\chi^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) - \mathbb{E}\chi^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})| \geqslant t) \\
&\leqslant 2\exp\Bigg(- C\min\Bigg\{ \left(\frac{t}{24(\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_1\|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_2 \vee \|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_1\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_2)K^{3/2}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|}\right)^2, \\
&\qquad \frac{t}{24(\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_1 \vee \|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_1)K\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|}, \\
&\qquad \left(\frac{t}{24(\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_2 \vee \|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_2)K\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|}\right)^{2/3}, \\
&\qquad \left(\frac{t}{24(\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_2 \vee \|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_2)K\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|}\right)^{1/2} \Bigg\}\Bigg).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma D.1. The proof is similar to that of Lemma C.1. We first compute various norms of the expectation of derivatives of $\chi^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ to get a tail bound by using [31, Theorem 1.4].

First, it is easy to verify that $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\chi^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla^3_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\chi^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ are zero vector of length MKD and zero tensor of size MKD-by-MKD-by-MKD, respectively. Since $\chi^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is a fourth-order polynomial in $\boldsymbol{\phi}$, we only need to compute the second and fourth derivatives.

Let $\boldsymbol{\phi}_m$ denote $\mathrm{vec}(\Phi_{\mathrm{m}})$ for $m \in [M]$. It is easy to verify that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \mathbf{0}, \quad \forall m' \neq m.$$

Then $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is expressed as

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = (\boldsymbol{e}_m \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_m)\tilde{\otimes}\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) + (\boldsymbol{e}_{m'} \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_{m'})\tilde{\otimes}\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}).$$

Therefore, $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\chi^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is a block diagonal matrix given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\chi^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = &\sum_{m=1}^{M}\sum_{\substack{m'=1\\m'\neq m}}^{M} b_m b'_{m'}(\boldsymbol{e}_m \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_m)\tilde{\otimes}\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) \\
&+ \sum_{m=1}^{M}\sum_{\substack{m'=1\\m'\neq m}}^{M} b_m b'_{m'}(\boldsymbol{e}_{m'} \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_{m'})\tilde{\otimes}\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}).
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Then we show that the norms of each block is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\| &\leqslant 2K\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|, \\
\|\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\mathrm{F}} &\leqslant 2K^{3/2}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|, \\
\|\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\| &\leqslant 2K\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|, \\
\|\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\mathrm{F}} &\leqslant 2K^{3/2}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|.
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

By direct computation, the (k_1, k_2)th block of $\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} \chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_2}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_1}} \chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = &\langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_2}, \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1} \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'} \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' \circledast \mathfrak{J} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'} \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}' \circledast \mathfrak{J} \boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \rangle (\breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}) \\ &+ \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_2}, \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1} \circledast \mathfrak{J} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'} \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'} \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}' \circledast \mathfrak{J} \boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \rangle (\breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}),\end{aligned}$$

and the (k_1, k_2)th block of $\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}} \chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m',k_2}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m',k_1}} \chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = &\langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_2}, \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1} \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m} \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \circledast \mathfrak{J} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m} \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \circledast \mathfrak{J} \boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \rangle (\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}') \\ &+ \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_2}, \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1} \circledast \mathfrak{J} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m} \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m} \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \circledast \mathfrak{J} \boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \rangle (\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}' \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}').\end{aligned}$$

The expectation of $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_2}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_1}} \chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is given by

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_2}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_1}} \chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = K \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}'^{\top} \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}' \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_2}, \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1} \circledast \mathfrak{J} \boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \rangle (\breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} + \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}).$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} \chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = K \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}'^{\top} \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}' \boldsymbol{S}_{[K]} \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{\top} \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^{\top} \tilde{\otimes} (\breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} + \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}).$$

Similarly, we also have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}} \chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = K \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}^{\top} \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \boldsymbol{S}_{[K]} \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{\top} \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^{\top} \tilde{\otimes} (\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}' + \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}' \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}').$$

Then, (29) follows by the Kronecker product structure and the triangle inequality.

By applying (29) to (28), we obtain that the spectral and Frobenius norms of $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \chi^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ are respectively bounded by

$$\|\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \chi^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\| \leqslant 4(\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_\infty \|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_1 \vee \|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_\infty \|\boldsymbol{b}\|_1) K \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{\top} \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|,$$

and

$$\|\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \chi^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\mathrm{F}} \leqslant 4(\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_1 \vee \|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{b}\|_1) K^{3/2} \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{\top} \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|.$$

Note that $\nabla^4_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is a deterministic 4-way tensor and is represented as sum of block

structured tensors as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla^4_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) &= (\boldsymbol{e}_m\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_m\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_{m'}\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_{m'})\,\tilde{\otimes}\,(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}))\\ &+(\boldsymbol{e}_m\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_{m'}\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_m\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_{m'})\,\tilde{\otimes}\,(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}))\\ &+(\boldsymbol{e}_m\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_{m'}\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_{m'}\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_m)\,\tilde{\otimes}\,(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}))\\ &+(\boldsymbol{e}_{m'}\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_m\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_m\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_{m'})\,\tilde{\otimes}\,(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}))\\ &+(\boldsymbol{e}_{m'}\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_m\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_{m'}\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_m)\,\tilde{\otimes}\,(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}))\\ &+(\boldsymbol{e}_{m'}\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_{m'}\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_m\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_m)\,\tilde{\otimes}\,(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi})).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\nabla^4_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\chi^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla^4_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\chi^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) &= \sum_{m=1}^{M}\sum_{\substack{m'=1\\m'\neq m}}^{M} b_m b_{m'}(\boldsymbol{e}_m\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_m\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_{m'}\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_{m'})\,\tilde{\otimes}\,(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}))\\ &+\sum_{m=1}^{M}\sum_{\substack{m'=1\\m'\neq m}}^{M} b_m b_{m'}(\boldsymbol{e}_m\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_{m'}\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_m\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_{m'})\,\tilde{\otimes}\,(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}))\\ &+\sum_{m=1}^{M}\sum_{\substack{m'=1\\m'\neq m}}^{M} b_m b_{m'}(\boldsymbol{e}_m\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_{m'}\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_{m'}\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_m)\,\tilde{\otimes}\,(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}))\\ &+\sum_{m=1}^{M}\sum_{\substack{m'=1\\m'\neq m}}^{M} b_m b_{m'}(\boldsymbol{e}_{m'}\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_m\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_m\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_{m'})\,\tilde{\otimes}\,(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}))\\ &+\sum_{m=1}^{M}\sum_{\substack{m'=1\\m'\neq m}}^{M} b_m b_{m'}(\boldsymbol{e}_{m'}\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_m\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_{m'}\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_m)\,\tilde{\otimes}\,(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}))\\ &+\sum_{m=1}^{M}\sum_{\substack{m'=1\\m'\neq m}}^{M} b_m b_{m'}(\boldsymbol{e}_{m'}\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_{m'}\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_m\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_m)\,\tilde{\otimes}\,(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi})).\end{aligned}$$

To proceed, we will use the following lemma, the proof of which is deferred to the end of this section.

Lemma D.2. *Let $m, m' \in [M]$ satisfy $m' \neq m$. Suppose that two of $\{m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4\}$ are m and the others are m'. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned}&\max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\in P_4\\|\mathcal{J}|\geqslant 2}} \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_4}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_3}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_2}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_1}}\chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\mathcal{J}} \leqslant 4K\|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2\|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}'\|_2\|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2\|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}'\|_2,\\ &\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_4}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_3}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_2}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_1}}\chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\{1,2,3,4\}} \leqslant 4K^{3/2}\|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2\|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}'\|_2\|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2\|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}'\|_2.\end{aligned}$$

For $f : [M]^6 \to \{0,1\}$, define

$$\zeta(f) := \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{\substack{m'=1 \\ m' \neq m}}^{M} \sum_{m_1,m_2,m_3,m_4=1}^{M} b_m b_{m'} f(m_1,m_2,m_3,m_4,m,m') \cdot (\boldsymbol{e}_{m_1} \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_{m_2} \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_{m_3} \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_{m_4}) \tilde{\otimes} (\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_4}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_3}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_2}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_1}} \chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}))$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned}
f_1(m_1,m_2,m_3,m_4,m,m') &= [\, m_1 = m, m_2 = m, m_3 = m', m_4 = m' \,], \\
f_2(m_1,m_2,m_3,m_4,m,m') &= [\, m_1 = m, m_2 = m', m_3 = m, m_4 = m' \,], \\
f_3(m_1,m_2,m_3,m_4,m,m') &= [\, m_1 = m, m_2 = m', m_3 = m', m_4 = m \,], \\
f_4(m_1,m_2,m_3,m_4,m,m') &= [\, m_1 = m', m_2 = m, m_3 = m, m_4 = m' \,], \\
f_5(m_1,m_2,m_3,m_4,m,m') &= [\, m_1 = m', m_2 = m, m_3 = m', m_4 = m \,], \\
f_6(m_1,m_2,m_3,m_4,m,m') &= [\, m_1 = m', m_2 = m', m_3 = m, m_4 = m \,].
\end{aligned}$$

Here, $[\cdot]$ denotes the Iverson bracket. For example,

$$[\, m_1 = m, m_2 = m, m_3 = m', m_4 = m' \,] = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } m_1 = m, m_2 = m, m_3 = m', m_4 = m' \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Then

$$\nabla^4_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \chi^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \sum_{k=1}^{6} \zeta(f_k).$$

First, we compute $\|\nabla^4_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \chi^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\{1,2,3,4\}}$. For each $k = 1, \ldots, 6$, $\zeta(f_k)$ is a block tensor, M-by-M-by-M-by-M array of block size KD-by-KD-by-KD-by-KD, which has only $M(M-1)$ nonzero blocks. By Lemma D.2,

$$\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_4}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_3}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_2}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_1}} \chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\{1,2,3,4\}} \leqslant 4K^{3/2} \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|$$

provided that $f_k(m_1,m_2,m_3,m_4,m,m') = 1$ for some $k \in [6]$. Therefore,

$$\|\nabla^4_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \chi^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\{1,2,3,4\}} \leqslant \sum_{k=1}^{6} \|\zeta(f_k)\|_{\{1,2,3,4\}} \leqslant 24 \|\boldsymbol{b}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_2 K^{3/2} \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|.$$

Second, we compute $\|\nabla^4_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \chi^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\{1,2\}\{3,4\}}$. If we rearrange $\zeta(f_1)$ and $\zeta(f_6)$ to $(MKD)^2$-by-$(MKD)^2$ matrices along the partition $\{1,2\}\{3,4\}$, the resulting matrices are block matrices, M^2-

by-M^2 array of block size $(KD)^2$-by-$(KD)^2$, whose nonzero blocks are within M-by-M subarray out of M^2-by-M^2. Therefore,

$$\|\zeta(f_k)\|_{\{1,2\}\{3,4\}} \leqslant 4(\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_1 \vee \|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_1)K\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|, \quad k = 1, 6.$$

On the other hand, when f_2, f_3, f_4, f_5 are 1, $m_1 \neq m_2$ and $m_3 \neq m_4$. If we rearrange $\zeta(f_k)$ for $k = 2, 3, 4, 5$ to $(MKD)^2$-by-$(MKD)^2$ matrices along the partition $\{1, 2\}\{3, 4\}$, the resulting matrices are block matrices whose nonzero blocks are on the diagonal with block column permutations. Therefore,

$$\|\zeta(f_k)\|_{\{1,2\}\{3,4\}} \leqslant 4\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_\infty K\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|, \quad k = 2, 3, 4, 5.$$

Combining the results, we get

$$\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^4\chi^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\{1,2\}\{3,4\}} \leqslant 24(\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_1 \vee \|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_1)K\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|.$$

Next, we compute $\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^4\chi^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\{1,2,3\}\{4\}}$. If we rearrange $\zeta(f_k)$ to a $(MKD)^3$-by-MKD matrix along the partition $\{1, 2, 3\}\{4\}$, the resulting matrix is a block matrix, M^3-by-M array of block size $(KD)^3$-by-KD. Since m_4 coincides with one of $\{m_1, m_2, m_3\}$ and is different from the other two, the locations of nonzero blocks in subarrays of size M^3-by-1 are disjoint. Therefore,

$$\|\zeta(f_k)\|_{\{1,2,3\}\{4\}} \leqslant 4K(\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_2 \vee \|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_2), \quad \forall k = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.$$

Then it follows that

$$\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^4\chi^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\{1,2,3\}\{4\}} \leqslant 24(\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_2 \vee \|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_2)K\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|. \tag{30}$$

For other partitions $\mathcal{J} \in P_4$, corresponding rearrangements are different from the above cases only up to tensor permutations, which do not change the tensor norms. Therefore,

$$\max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\in P_4\\ |\mathcal{J}|=2}} \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^4\chi^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\mathcal{J}} \leqslant 24(\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_1 \vee \|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_1)K\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|\|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2^2.$$

By (30) and the variational principle, we also have

$$\max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\in P_4\\ |\mathcal{J}|\geqslant 3}} \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^4\chi^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\mathcal{J}} \leqslant 24(\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_2 \vee \|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_2)K\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\|.$$

Applying the norm bounds to [31, Theorem 1.4] completes the proof. □

Proof of Lemma D.2. The proof of Lemma D.2 is almost the same to the proof of Lemma C.2. We

consider the case where $m_1 = m_2 = m$ and $m_3 = m_4 = m'$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m',k_4}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m',k_3}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_2}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_1}} \chi^{(1)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) \\
&= \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_4 \ominus k_3 \oplus k_2 \ominus k_1 \oplus 1}, \mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \rangle (\breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}' + \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}' \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}') \\
&+ \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_4 \ominus k_3 \ominus k_2 \oplus k_1 \oplus 1}, \mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \rangle (\breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}' \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' + \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}').
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

We consider the first summand in (31), which corresponds to the tensor $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{R}^{KD \times KD \times KD \times KD}$ whose (k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4)th block of size $D \times D \times D \times D$ is given by

$$[\ k_4 \ominus k_3 \oplus k_2 \ominus k_1 = 0\ ](\breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}' + \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}' \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}').$$

Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K \times K \times K}$ be given by

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}(k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4) = \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_4 \ominus k_3 \oplus k_2 \ominus k_1 \oplus 1}, \mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \rangle.$$

Then,

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}} = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}} \tilde{\otimes} (\breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}' + \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}' \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}').$$

For any $\mathcal{J} \in P_4$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}' + \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}' \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}'\|_{\mathcal{J}} \\
&\leqslant \|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}'\|_{\mathcal{J}} + \|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}' \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}'\|_{\mathcal{J}} \\
&= 2\|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2 \|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}'\|_2 \|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2 \|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}'\|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}}\|_{\mathcal{J}} = \|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}\|_{\mathcal{J}} \|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}' + \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}' \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}'\|_{\mathcal{J}} \leqslant 2\|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}\|_{\mathcal{J}} \|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2 \|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}'\|_2 \|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2 \|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}'\|_2.$$

By Lemma C.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{\substack{\mathcal{J} \in P_4 \\ |\mathcal{J}| \geqslant 2}} \|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}}\|_{\mathcal{J}} \leqslant 2K \|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2 \|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}'\|_2 \|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2 \|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}'\|_2, \\
&\|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}}\|_{\{1,2,3,4\}} \leqslant 2K^{3/2} \|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2 \|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}'\|_2 \|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2 \|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}'\|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

The tensor corresponding to the second summand in (31) is obtained by applying tensor permutations to $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}}$, which preserves the tensor norms. Therefore, applying the triangle inequality provides the tensor norm bounds in the case where $m_1 = m_2 = m$ and $m_3 = m_4 = m'$.

Using the same permutation invariance argument, we have the same tensor norm bounds for the other cases. This completes the proof. □

E Matrix and Tensor Norms: Diagonal & 3rd Order

Lemma E.1. *Let $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_m \in \mathbb{R}^{K\times D}$ for $m \in [M]$. Let $\boldsymbol{\phi} = [\mathrm{vec}(\Phi_1)^\top, \ldots, \mathrm{vec}(\Phi_{\mathrm{M}})^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathrm{MKD}}$. Suppose that $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ is a random vector following $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_{MKD\times 1}, \boldsymbol{I}_{MKD})$. Let $\boldsymbol{a} = [a_1, \ldots, a_M]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^M$ and $\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}, \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}, \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' \in \mathbb{S}^{D-1}$. Let*

$$h^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \sum_{m=1}^{M} a_m h_m^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}),$$

where

$$h_m^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \langle \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' \circledast \boldsymbol{x}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \circledast \boldsymbol{w}_m \rangle.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}(|h^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) - \mathbb{E}h^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})| \geqslant t) \\
&\leqslant 2\exp\Bigg(- C\min\Bigg\{ \left(\frac{t}{6\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2 K \max_{m\in[M]} \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|}\right)^2, \\
&\qquad \frac{t}{6\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty \sqrt{K} \max_{m\in[M]} \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|}, \\
&\qquad \left(\frac{t}{6\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty \sqrt{K} \max_{m\in[M]} \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|}\right)^{2/3} \Bigg\}\Bigg).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma E.1. The proof is similar to that of Lemma C.1. We will get a tail bound on $|h^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} h^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})|$ by using [31, Theorem 1.4]. To this end, we need to compute various norms of the expectation of derivatives of $h^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$.

First, it is easy to verify that $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^2 h^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is a zero matrix of size MKD-by-MKD. Since $h^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is a third-order polynomial in $\boldsymbol{\phi}$, we only need to compute the first and third derivatives.

Let $\boldsymbol{\phi}_m$ denote $\mathrm{vec}(\Phi_{\mathrm{m}})$ for $m \in [M]$. Then $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} h^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is expressed as

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} h^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \sum_{m=1}^{M} a_m \boldsymbol{e}_m \tilde{\otimes} \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} h_m^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}). \tag{32}$$

The k_1th block of $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} h_m^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_1}} h_m^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = &\langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1}, \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \circledast \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}} \boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{w}_m \rangle \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \\
&+ \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1}, \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \circledast \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}} \boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{w}_m \rangle \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' \\
&+ \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}} \boldsymbol{w}_m \rangle \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemmas B.1 and B.2,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_1}}h_m^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) &= K\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}'\langle\boldsymbol{e}_{k_1},\mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{x}\circledast\boldsymbol{w}_m\rangle\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\\ &\quad+K\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\langle\boldsymbol{e}_{k_1},\mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{x}\circledast\boldsymbol{w}_m\rangle\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}'\\ &\quad+\sum_{k=1}^{K}\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\langle\boldsymbol{e}_{k_1},\boldsymbol{e}_{2k-1}\circledast\boldsymbol{x}\circledast\mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{w}_m\rangle\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}h_m^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) &= K\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}'\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}(\mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{x}\circledast\boldsymbol{w}_m)\tilde{\otimes}\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\\ &\quad+K\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}(\mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{x}\circledast\boldsymbol{w}_m)\tilde{\otimes}\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}'\\ &\quad+\sum_{k=1}^{K}\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}(\boldsymbol{e}_{2k-1}\circledast\boldsymbol{x}\circledast\mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{w}_m)\tilde{\otimes}\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}.\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\|\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}(\mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{x}\circledast\boldsymbol{w}_m\circledast\boldsymbol{e}_t)\|_2=\|\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\boldsymbol{e}_t\|_2\leqslant\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|,\quad\forall t\in[L],$$

we have

$$\|\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}h_m^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_2\leqslant 3K\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|.\tag{33}$$

Therefore, by applying (33) to (32), we have

$$\|\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}h^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|\leqslant 3\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2K\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|.$$

The third derivative of $h^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is given by

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^3h^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})=\sum_{m=1}^{M}a_m(\boldsymbol{e}_m\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_m\otimes\boldsymbol{e}_m)\tilde{\otimes}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}^3h_m^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}).$$

The norms of each block is given by the following lemma.

Lemma E.2.

$$\begin{aligned}\max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\in P_3\\|\mathcal{J}|\geqslant 2}}\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}^3h_m^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\mathcal{J}}&\leqslant 6\sqrt{K}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|\|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2\|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2\|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}'\|_2\\ \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}^3h_m^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\{1,2,3\}}&\leqslant 6K\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|\|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2\|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2\|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}'\|_2.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\nabla^3_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} h^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is block diagonal, by Lemma E.2, we have

$$\max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\in P_3\\ |\mathcal{J}|\geqslant 2}} \|\nabla^3_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} h^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\mathcal{J}} \leqslant 6\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_\infty \sqrt{K} \max_{m\in[M]} \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|,$$

and

$$\|\nabla^3_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} h^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\{1,2,3\}} \leqslant 6\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_2 K \max_{m\in[M]} \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|.$$

Applying the norm bounds to [31, Theorem 1.4] completes the proof. □

Now, we present the proof of Lemma E.2. We will use the following lemma to prove Lemma E.2.

Lemma E.3. *Let $a_1, a_2, a_3 \in \{\pm 1\}$ and $b \in [L]$. Let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}} \in \mathbb{R}^{K\times K\times K}$ be given*

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}(k_1,k_2,k_3) = \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{a_3k_3 \oplus a_2k_2 \oplus a_1k_1 \oplus b}, \mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{w}_m\rangle,$$

for all $k_1, k_2, k_3 \in [K]$. Then

$$\max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\in P_3\\ |\mathcal{J}|\geqslant 2}} \|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}\|_{\mathcal{J}} \leqslant \sqrt{K}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|,$$

$$\|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}\|_{\{1,2,3\}} \leqslant K\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|.$$

Proof of Lemma E.2. The (k_1,k_2,k_3)th block of $\nabla^3_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} h^{(2)}_m(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_3}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_2}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_1}} h^{(2)}_m(\boldsymbol{\phi}) &= \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_3}, \boldsymbol{e}_{k_2} \circledast \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1} \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \circledast \mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{w}_m\rangle (\breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} + \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}) \\
&= \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_3}, \boldsymbol{e}_{k_2} \circledast \mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{e}_{k_1} \circledast \mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{w}_m\rangle (\breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' + \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}) \\
&= \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_3}, \mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{e}_{k_2} \circledast \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1} \circledast \mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{w}_m\rangle (\breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' + \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}).
\end{aligned}$$

Then, Lemma E.2 is a simple corollary of Lemma E.3. Since the proof of Lemma E.2 is essentially the repetition of the proof of Lemma C.2. Therefore, we omit the proof. □

Proof of Lemma E.3. We consider the case where $a_1 = a_3 = 1$, $a_2 = -1$, and $b = 0$. Then $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}} \in \mathbb{R}^{K\times K\times K\times K}$ is given by

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}(k_1,k_2,k_3) = \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_3 \ominus k_2 \oplus k_1}, \mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{w}_m\rangle.$$

Let $\boldsymbol{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{K^2\times K}$ be obtained by rearranging the tensor $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}$ as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{C}(K(k_1-1)+k_2, k_3) = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}(k_1,k_2,k_3).$$

Let $\boldsymbol{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{L^2 \times L}$ be given by

$$\boldsymbol{H}(L(t_1-1)+t_2, t_3) = \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{t_3 \ominus t_2 \oplus t_1}, \mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{w}_m \rangle,$$

for $t_1, t_2, t_3 \in [L]$. Note that $\boldsymbol{H}$ is a L-by-1 array of blocks of size L-by-L, where each block is a circulant matrix where its first column is a circular shift of $\mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{w}_{m'}$. Then $\boldsymbol{H}$ and $\boldsymbol{C}$ are related by

$$\boldsymbol{C} = ((\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]} \tilde{\otimes} \boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}) \otimes \boldsymbol{S}_{[K]})\boldsymbol{H}.$$

We partition $\boldsymbol{C}$ as a K-by-1 array of blocks of size $K \times K$. Then each block is obtained by applying $\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}$ and $\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top$ respectively from the left and right to the corresponding block of $\boldsymbol{H}$. Therefore, the spectral norm of each block is given by

$$\|\boldsymbol{S}_{[k]} \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m} \boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}^\top\| = \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|.$$

Therefore, by simple algebra (direct computation or block Gershgorin), it follows that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}\|_{\{1,2\}\{3\}} = \|\boldsymbol{C}\| \leqslant \sqrt{K}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|.$$

For other partitions $\mathcal{J} \in P_4$ of size 2, the resulting matrix of size K^2-by-K or K-by-K^2 has the same structure as in $\boldsymbol{C}$ or $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{C}}$ by tensor permutations and/or tensor transpose. Therefore, we have

$$\max_{\substack{\mathcal{J} \in P_3 \\ |\mathcal{J}|=2}} \|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}\|_{\mathcal{J}} \leqslant \sqrt{K}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|.$$

By the variational characterization of the tensor norms, finer partition results in a smaller tensor norm, i.e., it follows that

$$\max_{\substack{\mathcal{J} \in P_3 \\ |\mathcal{J}|\geqslant 2}} \|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}\|_{\mathcal{J}} \leqslant \max_{\substack{\mathcal{J} \in P_3 \\ |\mathcal{J}|=2}} \|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}\|_{\mathcal{J}} \leqslant \sqrt{K}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|.$$

Finally, since each block of $\boldsymbol{C}$ is of size K-by-K, its rank is at most K. Therefore, the Frobenius norm of each block is upper bounded by $\sqrt{K}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|$. Since there are K blocks in $\boldsymbol{C}$, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{C}}\|_{\{1,2,3\}} = \|\boldsymbol{C}\|_{\mathrm{F}} \leqslant K\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|.$$

This completes the proof. □

F Matrix and Tensor Norms: Off-Diagonal & 3rd Order

Lemma F.1. *Let $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_m \in \mathbb{R}^{K\times D}$ for $m \in [M]$. Let $\boldsymbol{\phi} = [\mathrm{vec}(\Phi_1)^\top, \ldots, \mathrm{vec}(\Phi_{\mathrm{M}})^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathrm{MKD}}$. Suppose that $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ is a random vector following $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_{MKD\times 1}, \boldsymbol{I}_{MKD})$. Let $\boldsymbol{b} = [b_1, \ldots, b_M]^\top, \boldsymbol{b'} = [b'_1, \ldots, b'_M]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^M$ and $\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}, \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}', \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}, \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' \in \mathbb{S}^{D-1}$. Let*

$$\chi^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{\substack{m'=1 \\ m'\neq m}}^{M} b_m b'_{m'} \chi^{(2)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}),$$

where

$$\chi^{(2)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \langle \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{m'} \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' \circledast \boldsymbol{x}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \circledast \boldsymbol{w}_{m'} \rangle.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}(|\chi^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) - \mathbb{E}\chi^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})| \geqslant t) \\
&\leqslant 2\exp\Bigg(- C\min\Bigg\{ \left(\frac{t}{6\|\boldsymbol{b'}\|_2(\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_2 \vee |\mathbb{1}^\top \boldsymbol{b}| + \|\boldsymbol{b}\|_\infty) K \max_{m\in[M]} \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|}\right)^2, \\
&\qquad \frac{t}{6(\|\boldsymbol{b'}\|_1\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_\infty \vee \|\boldsymbol{b}\|_1\|\boldsymbol{b'}\|_\infty)\sqrt{K}\max_{m\in[M]} \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|}, \\
&\qquad \left(\frac{t}{6(\|\boldsymbol{b'}\|_1\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_\infty \vee \|\boldsymbol{b}\|_1\|\boldsymbol{b'}\|_\infty)\sqrt{K}\max_{m\in[M]} \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|}, \right)^{2/3} \Bigg\}\Bigg).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma F.1. The proof is similar to that of Lemma C.1. We first compute various norms of the expectation of derivatives of $\chi^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$.

It is easy to verify that $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\chi^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is a MKD-byMKD matrix of all zero entries. Since $\chi^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is a third-order polynomial in $\boldsymbol{\phi}$, we only need to compute the first and third derivatives.

By the independence among all $\boldsymbol{\phi}_m$'s, it follows that $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\chi^{(2)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is given by

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\chi^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{\substack{m'=1 \\ m'\neq m}}^{M} b_m b_{m'} \boldsymbol{e}_{m'} \tilde{\otimes} \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\chi^{(2)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}). \tag{34}$$

The k_1th block of $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\chi^{(2)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is given by

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m',k_1}}\chi^{(2)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1}, \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \circledast \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \circledast \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}}\boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{w}_{m'} \rangle \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}'.$$

Therefore, by Lemma B.1,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m',k_1}}\chi^{(2)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = K\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1}, \boldsymbol{\mathfrak{J}}\boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{w}_{m'} \rangle \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}'.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}} \chi^{(2)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = K \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}(\mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{w}_{m'}) \tilde{\otimes} \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}'.$$

Since

$$\|\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}(\mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{w}_{m'})\|_2 = \|\boldsymbol{S}_{[K]} \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{w}_{m'}\|_2 \leqslant \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\|,$$

we have

$$\left\| \sum_{\substack{m=1 \\ m \neq m'}}^{M} \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} b_m \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}} \chi^{(2)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) \right\|_2 \leqslant K \left(\left| \sum_{m=1}^{M} b_m \right| + \|\boldsymbol{b}\|_\infty \right) \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\|. \tag{35}$$

Applying the above bound on the norm of blocks to (34), we obtain

$$\|\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \chi^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\| \leqslant \|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_2 (|\mathbb{1}^\top \boldsymbol{b}| + \|\boldsymbol{b}\|_\infty) K \max_{m \in [M]} \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|.$$

The third derivative of $\chi^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla^3_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \chi^{(2)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = & \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{\substack{m'=1 \\ m' \neq m}}^{M} b_m b_{m'} (\boldsymbol{e}_{m'} \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_{m'} \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_m) \tilde{\otimes} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}} \chi^{(2)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) \\
& + \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{\substack{m'=1 \\ m' \neq m}}^{M} b_m b_{m'} (\boldsymbol{e}_{m'} \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_m \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_{m'}) \tilde{\otimes} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}} \chi^{(2)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) \\
& + \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{\substack{m'=1 \\ m' \neq m}}^{M} b_m b_{m'} (\boldsymbol{e}_m \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_{m'} \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_{m'}) \tilde{\otimes} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} \chi^{(2)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}).
\end{aligned}$$

The (k_1, k_2, k_3)th block of $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}} \chi^{(2)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_3}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_2}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m',k_1}} \chi^{(2)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) &= \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_3}, \boldsymbol{e}_{k_2} \circledast \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1} \circledast \boldsymbol{x} \circledast \mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{w}_{m'} \rangle (\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}}) \\
&= \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_3}, \boldsymbol{e}_{k_2} \circledast \mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{e}_{k_1} \circledast \mathfrak{J}\boldsymbol{x} \circledast \boldsymbol{w}_{m'} \rangle (\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}' \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}).
\end{aligned}$$

The following lemma is a corollary of Lemma E.3. In fact, the proof of Lemma F.2 is essentially the repetition of the proof of Lemma D.2. Therefore, we omit the proof.

Lemma F.2. *Let $m, m' \in [M]$ satisfy $m' \neq m$. Suppose that one of $\{m_1, m_2, m_3\}$ is m' and the other two are m. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{\substack{\mathcal{J} \in P_3 \\ |\mathcal{J}| \geqslant 2}} \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_3}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_2}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_1}} \chi^{(2)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\mathcal{J}} &\leqslant 2\sqrt{K} \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\| \|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2 \|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2 \|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}'\|_2, \\
\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_3}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_2}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_1}} \chi^{(2)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\{1,2,3\}} &\leqslant 2K \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\| \|\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2 \|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_2 \|\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}'\|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

For $f : [M]^5 \to \{0,1\}$, define

$$\zeta(f) := \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{\substack{m'=1 \\ m' \neq m}}^{M} \sum_{m_1,m_2,m_3=1}^{M} b_m b'_{m'} f(m_1, m_2, m_3, m, m') \cdot (\boldsymbol{e}_{m_1} \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_{m_2} \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_{m_3}) \tilde{\otimes} (\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_3}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_2}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_1}} \chi^{(2)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}))$$

Let

$$f_1(m_1, m_2, m_3, m, m') = [\, m_1 = m', m_2 = m', m_3 = m \,],$$
$$f_2(m_1, m_2, m_3, m, m') = [\, m_1 = m', m_2 = m, m_3 = m' \,],$$
$$f_3(m_1, m_2, m_3, m, m') = [\, m_1 = m, m_2 = m', m_3 = m' \,].$$

Then

$$\nabla^3_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \chi^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \sum_{k=1}^{3} \zeta(f_k).$$

First, we compute $\|\nabla^3_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \chi^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\{1,2,3\}}$. For each $k \in \{1,2,3\}$, $\zeta(f_k)$ is a block tensor, M-by-M-by-M array of block size KD-by-KD-by-KD, which has only $M(M-1)$ nonzero blocks. By Lemma F.2, it holds

$$\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_3}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_2}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m_1}} \chi^{(2)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\{1,2,3\}} \leqslant 2K \max_{m \in [M]} \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|$$

provided that $f_k(m_1, m_2, m_3, m, m') = 1$ for some $k \in [3]$. Therefore,

$$\|\nabla^4_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \chi^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\{1,2,3\}} \leqslant \sum_{k=1}^{3} \|\zeta(f_k)\|_{\{1,2,3\}} \leqslant 6\|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{b}\|_2 K \max_{m \in [M]} \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|.$$

Second, we compute $\|\nabla^3_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \chi^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\{1,2\}\{3\}}$. If we rearrange $\zeta(f_1)$ to a $(MKD)^2$-by-MKD matrix along the partition $\{1,2\}\{3\}$, the resulting matrix is a block matrix, M^2-by-M array of block size $(KD)^2$-by-KD, whose nonzero blocks are within M-by-M subarray out of M^2-by-M. Therefore,

$$\|\zeta(f_1)\|_{\{1,2\}\{3\}} \leqslant 2(\|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{b}\|_\infty \vee \|\boldsymbol{b}\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_\infty) \sqrt{K} \max_{m \in [M]} \|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|.$$

If we rearrange $\zeta(f_2)$ and $\zeta(f_3)$ to $(MKD)^2$-by-MKD matrices along the partition $\{1,2\}\{3\}$, the resulting matrix is a block matrix, M^2-by-M array of block size $(KD)^2$-by-KD. Since m_3 coincides with one of $\{m_1, m_2\}$ and is different from the other, the locations of nonzero blocks in subarrays

of size M^2-by-1 are disjoint. Therefore,

$$\|\zeta(f_k)\|_{\{1,2\}\{3\}} \leqslant 2(\|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_2 \vee \|\boldsymbol{b}\|_\infty\|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_2)\sqrt{K}\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|, \quad \forall k=2,3.$$

Combining the results, we get

$$\|\nabla^3_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\chi^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\{1,2\}\{3\}} \leqslant 6(\|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_1\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_\infty \vee \|\boldsymbol{b}\|_1\|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_\infty)\sqrt{K}\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|.$$

For other partitions $\mathcal{J}\in P_3$, corresponding rearrangements are different from the above cases only up to tensor permutations, which do not change the tensor norms. Therefore,

$$\max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\in P_3\\|\mathcal{J}|=2}}\|\nabla^3_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\chi^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\mathcal{J}} \leqslant 6(\|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_1\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_\infty \vee \|\boldsymbol{b}\|_1\|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_\infty)\sqrt{K}\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|.$$

By the variational principle, we also have

$$\max_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\in P_3\\|\mathcal{J}|\geqslant 2}}\|\nabla^3_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\chi^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\mathcal{J}} \leqslant 6(\|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_1\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_\infty \vee \|\boldsymbol{b}\|_1\|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_\infty)\sqrt{K}\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\|.$$

Applying the norm bounds to [31, Theorem 1.4] completes the proof. □

G Matrix and Tensor Norms: Diagonal & 2nd Order

Lemma G.1. *Let $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_m \in \mathbb{R}^{K\times D}$ for $m\in[M]$. Let $\boldsymbol{\phi} = [\mathrm{vec}(\Phi_1)^\top,\ldots,\mathrm{vec}(\Phi_{\mathrm{M}})^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathrm{MKD}}$. Suppose that $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ is a random vector following $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{0}_{MKD\times 1}, \boldsymbol{I}_{MKD})$. Let $\boldsymbol{b} = [b_1,\ldots,b_M]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^M$ and $\breve{\boldsymbol{u}},\breve{\boldsymbol{v}},\breve{\boldsymbol{v}}'\in\mathbb{S}^{D-1}$. Let*

$$h^{(4)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \sum_{m=1}^M b_m h_m^{(4)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}),$$

where

$$h_m^{(4)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}^\top\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m^\top(\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m} - \sigma_w^2 L\boldsymbol{I}_L)\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m\breve{\boldsymbol{u}}.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}(|h^{(4)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}h^{(4)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})| \geqslant t)\\ &\leqslant 2\exp\left(-C\min\left\{\left(\frac{t}{2\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_2\sqrt{K}\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m} - \sigma_w^2 L\boldsymbol{I}_K\|}\right)^2,\right.\right.\\ &\qquad\left.\left.\frac{t}{2\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_\infty\max_{m\in[M]}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}^\top\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m} - \sigma_w^2 L\boldsymbol{I}_K\|}\right\}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma G.1. The proof is similar to that of Lemma C.1. We will get a tail bound on

$|h^{(4)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} h^{(4)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})|$ by using [31, Theorem 1.4].

Note that $h^{(4)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is a quadratic form in $\boldsymbol{\phi}$. In this particular case, [31, Theorem 1.4] reduces to the Hanson-Wright inequality. To apply it, we compute the matrix norms of the second derivative.

The second derivative of $h^{(4)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ satisfies

$$\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} h^{(4)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{v}) = \sum_{m=1}^{M} b_m (\boldsymbol{e}_m \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_m) \tilde{\otimes} \nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} h^{(4)}_m(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{v}).$$

The (k_1, k_2)th block of $\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} h^{(4)}_m(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is given by

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_2}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_1}} h^{(4)}_m(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_2}, \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1} \circledast (\mathfrak{J} \boldsymbol{w}_m \circledast \boldsymbol{w}_m - \boldsymbol{e}_1) \rangle (\breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} + \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}).$$

Therefore,

$$\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} h^{(4)}_m(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \boldsymbol{S}_{[K]} (\boldsymbol{C}^\top_{\boldsymbol{w}_m} \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m} - \sigma_w^2 L \boldsymbol{I}_L) \boldsymbol{S}^\top_{[K]} \tilde{\otimes} (\breve{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} + \breve{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \breve{\boldsymbol{v}}).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} h^{(4)}_m(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{v})\| &\leqslant 2 \|\boldsymbol{T}^\top_{\boldsymbol{w}_m} \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m} - \sigma_w^2 L \boldsymbol{I}_K\|, \\ \|\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} h^{(4)}_m(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{v})\|_{\mathrm{F}} &\leqslant 2\sqrt{K} \|\boldsymbol{T}^\top_{\boldsymbol{w}_m} \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m} - \sigma_w^2 L \boldsymbol{I}_K\|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} h^{(4)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{v})$ is block diagonal, we have

$$\|\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} h^{(4)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{v})\| \leqslant 2 \|\boldsymbol{b}\|_\infty \max_{m \in [M]} \|\boldsymbol{T}^\top_{\boldsymbol{w}_m} \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m} - \sigma_w^2 L \boldsymbol{I}_K\|,$$

and

$$\|\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} h^{(4)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{v})\|_{\mathrm{F}} \leqslant 2 \|\boldsymbol{b}\|_2 \sqrt{K} \max_{m \in [M]} \|\boldsymbol{T}^\top_{\boldsymbol{w}_m} \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m} - \sigma_w^2 L \boldsymbol{I}_K\|.$$

Applying the norm bounds to [31, Theorem 1.4] completes the proof. □

H Matrix and Tensor Norms: Off-Diagonal & 2nd Order

Lemma H.1. *Let $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_m \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times D}$ for $m \in [M]$. Let $\boldsymbol{\phi} = [\mathrm{vec}(\Phi_1)^\top, \ldots, \mathrm{vec}(\Phi_{\mathrm{M}})^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathrm{MKD}}$. Suppose that $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ is a random vector following $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{0}_{MKD \times 1}, \boldsymbol{I}_{MKD})$. Let $\boldsymbol{b} = [b_1, \ldots, b_M]^\top, \boldsymbol{b}' =$*

$[b'_1, \ldots, b'_M]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^M$ *and* $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}} \in \mathbb{S}^{D-1}$. *Let*

$$\chi^{(4)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{\substack{m'=1 \\ m' \neq m}}^{M} b_m b'_{m'} \chi^{(4)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}),$$

where

$$\chi^{(4)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}^\top \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}^\top_{m'} \boldsymbol{C}^\top_{\boldsymbol{w}_m} \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_m \widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}(|h^{(4)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})| \geqslant t) \\
&\leqslant 2 \exp\left(-C \min\left\{ \left(\frac{t}{2\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_2 \sqrt{K} \max_{m,m' \in [M]} \|\boldsymbol{T}^\top_{\boldsymbol{w}_m} \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\|} \right)^2, \right.\right. \\
&\qquad \left.\left. \frac{t}{2(\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_\infty \vee \|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{b}\|_\infty) \max_{m,m' \in [M]} \|\boldsymbol{T}^\top_{\boldsymbol{w}_m} \boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\|} \right\} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma H.1. The proof is similar to that of Lemma G.1. The tail bound is given by the Hanson-Wright inequality, a special case of [31, Theorem 1.4]. We compute the matrix norms of the second derivative as follows.

The second derivative of $\chi^{(4)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \chi^{(4)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = &\sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{\substack{m'=1 \\ m' \neq m}}^{M} (\boldsymbol{e}_m \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_{m'}) \tilde{\otimes} \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} \chi^{(4)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) \\
&+ \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{\substack{m'=1 \\ m' \neq m}}^{M} (\boldsymbol{e}_{m'} \otimes \boldsymbol{e}_m) \tilde{\otimes} \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,m'}} \chi^{(4)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}).
\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

The (k_1, k_2)th block of $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} \chi^{(4)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is given by

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m',k_2}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_1}} \chi^{(4)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_2}, \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1} \circledast \mathfrak{J} \boldsymbol{w}_m \circledast \boldsymbol{w}_{m'} \rangle (\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}).$$

The (k_1, k_2)th block of $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}} \chi^{(4)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$ is given by

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m,k_2}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m',k_1}} \chi^{(4)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \langle \boldsymbol{e}_{k_2}, \boldsymbol{e}_{k_1} \circledast \mathfrak{J} \boldsymbol{w}_{m'} \circledast \boldsymbol{w}_m \rangle (\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}).$$

Therefore,

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m} \chi^{(4)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \boldsymbol{S}_{[K]} \boldsymbol{C}^\top_{\boldsymbol{w}_m} \boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}} \boldsymbol{S}^\top_{[K]} \tilde{\otimes} (\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}}),$$

and

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\chi^{(4)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \boldsymbol{S}_{[K]}\boldsymbol{C}^{\top}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\boldsymbol{C}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\boldsymbol{S}^{\top}_{[K]} \tilde{\otimes} (\widetilde{\boldsymbol{v}} \otimes \widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}).$$

Then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\chi^{(4)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\| &\leqslant \|\boldsymbol{T}^{\top}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\|,\\
\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\chi^{(4)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\mathrm{F}} &\leqslant \sqrt{K}\|\boldsymbol{T}^{\top}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\|,\\
\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\chi^{(4)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\| &\leqslant \|\boldsymbol{T}^{\top}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\|,\\
\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_m}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_{m'}}\chi^{(4)}_{m,m'}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\mathrm{F}} &\leqslant \sqrt{K}\|\boldsymbol{T}^{\top}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by (36), we have

$$\|\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\chi^{(4)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\| \leqslant 2(\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_1\|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_\infty \vee \|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_1\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_\infty) \max_{m,m'\in[M]} \|\boldsymbol{T}^{\top}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\|,$$

and

$$\|\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\chi^{(4)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})\|_{\mathrm{F}} \leqslant 2\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_2\|\boldsymbol{b}'\|_2\sqrt{K} \max_{m,m'\in[M]} \|\boldsymbol{T}^{\top}_{\boldsymbol{w}_m}\boldsymbol{T}_{\boldsymbol{w}_{m'}}\|.$$

Applying the norm bounds to [31, Theorem 1.4] completes the proof. □

References

[1] K. Lee, N. Tian, and J. K. Romberg, "Fast and guaranteed blind multichannel deconvolution under a bilinear channel model," in *Information Thoery Workshop*, Cambridge, UK, September 2016.

[2] D. Kundur and D. Hatzinakos, "Blind image deconvolution," *IEEE signal processing magazine*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 43–64, 1996.

[3] S. Choudhary and U. Mitra, "Sparse blind deconvolution: What cannot be done," in *International Symposium on Information Theory*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 3002–3006.

[4] Y. Li, K. Lee, and Y. Bresler, "A unified framework for identifiability analysis in bilinear inverse problems with applications to subspace and sparsity models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1501.06120*, 2015.

[5] E. Riegler, D. Stotz, and H. Bölcskei, "Information-theoretic limits of matrix completion," in *International Symposium on Information Theory*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 1836–1840.

[6] Y. Li, K. Lee, and Y. Bresler, "Optimal sample complexity for blind gain and phase calibration," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.07293*, 2015.

[7] ——, "Identifiability in blind deconvolution with subspace or sparsity constraints," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 62, no. 7, pp. 4266–4275, July 2016.

[8] M. Kech and F. Krahmer, "Optimal injectivity conditions for bilinear inverse problems with applications to identifiability of deconvolution problems," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.07316*, 2016.

[9] A. Ahmed, B. Recht, and J. Romberg, "Blind deconvolution using convex programming," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 60, no. 3, pp. 1711–1732, 2014.

[10] K. Lee, Y. Li, M. Junge, and Y. Bresler, "Blind recovery of sparse signals from subsampled convolution," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.06149*, 2015.

[11] X. Li, S. Ling, T. Strohmer, and K. Wei, "Rapid, robust, and reliable blind deconvolution via nonconvex optimization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.04933*, 2016.

[12] Y. Chi, "Guaranteed blind sparse spikes deconvolution via lifting and convex optimization," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 782–794, June 2016.

[13] D. Yang, G. Tang, and M. B. Wakin, "Super-resolution of complex exponentials from modulations with unknown waveforms," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1601.03712*, 2016.

[14] G. Xu, H. Liu, L. Tong, and T. Kailath, "A least-squares approach to blind channel identification," *IEEE Transactions on signal processing*, vol. 43, no. 12, pp. 2982–2993, 1995.

[15] E. Moulines, P. Duhamel, J.-F. Cardoso, and S. Mayrargue, "Subspace methods for the blind identification of multichannel FIR filters," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 43, no. 2, pp. 516–525, 1995.

[16] M. I. Gurelli and C. L. Nikias, "EVAM: An eigenvector-based algorithm for multichannel blind deconvolution of input colored signals," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 134–149, 1995.

[17] K. Abed-Meraim, W. Qiu, and Y. Hua, "Blind system identification," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 85, no. 8, pp. 1310–1322, 1997.

[18] L. Tong and S. Perreau, "Multichannel blind identification: From subspace to maximum likelihood methods," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 86, pp. 1951–1968, 1998.

[19] S. Mallat, *A wavelet tour of signal processing: the sparse way*. Academic press, 2008.

[20] W. Mantzel and J. Romberg, "Compressed subspace matching on the continuum," *Information and Inference*, p. iav008, 2015.

[21] N. Tian, S.-H. Byun, K. Sabrazand, and J. K. Romberg, "Multichannel myopic deconvolution in underwater acoustic channels via low-rank recovery," *submitted to The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*.

[22] M. A. Davenport and J. Romberg, "An overview of low-rank matrix recovery from incomplete observations," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 608–622, 2016.

[23] C. Davis and W. M. Kahan, "The rotation of eigenvectors by a perturbation. III," *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 1–46, 1970.

[24] F. Krahmer, S. Mendelson, and H. Rauhut, "Suprema of chaos processes and the restricted isometry property," *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 67, no. 11, pp. 1877–1904, 2014.

[25] M. Talagrand, *The generic chaining: upper and lower bounds of stochastic processes*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.

[26] M. Ledoux and M. Talagrand, *Probability in Banach Spaces: isoperimetry and processes*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.

[27] M. Rudelson and R. Vershynin, "On sparse reconstruction from fourier and gaussian measurements," *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 61, no. 8, pp. 1025–1045, 2008.

[28] H. Rauhut, "Compressive sensing and structured random matrices," *Theoretical foundations and numerical methods for sparse recovery*, vol. 9, pp. 1–92, 2010.

[29] R. Baraniuk, M. Davenport, R. DeVore, and M. Wakin, "A simple proof of the restricted isometry property for random matrices," *Constructive Approximation*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 253–263, 2008.

[30] R. Vershynin, "Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices," in *Compressed sensing: Theory and applications*, Y. Eldar and G. Kutyniok, Eds. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2012, ch. 5, pp. 210–268.

[31] R. Adamczak and P. Wolff, "Concentration inequalities for non-Lipschitz functions with bounded derivatives of higher order," *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, vol. 162, no. 3-4, pp. 531–586, 2015.